

REPEAT PERFORMANCES

OVIDIAN REPETITION
AND THE
METAMORPHOSES



Edited by
LAUREL FULKERSON
and
TIM STOVER

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

REPEAT PERFORMANCES



Publication of this volume has been made possible,
in part, through the generous support and enduring vision of

WARREN G. MOON.

REPEAT PERFORMANCES



Ovidian Repetition and the *Metamorphoses*

Edited by

LAUREL FULKERSON *and* TIM STOVER

The University of Wisconsin Press
1930 Monroe Street, 3rd Floor
Madison, Wisconsin 53711-2059
uwpress.wisc.edu

3 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden
London WC2E 8LU, United Kingdom
eurospanbookstore.com

Copyright © 2016

The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System
All rights reserved. Except in the case of brief quotations embedded in critical articles and reviews, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any format or by any means—digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—or conveyed via the Internet or a website without written permission of the University of Wisconsin Press. Rights inquiries should be directed to rights@uwpress.wisc.edu.

Printed in the United States of America

This book may be available in a digital edition.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fulkerson, Laurel, 1972– editor. | Stover, Tim, editor.

Title: Repeat performances : Ovidian repetition and the Metamorphoses /
edited by Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover.

Other titles: Wisconsin studies in classics.

Description: Madison, Wisconsin : The University of Wisconsin Press, [2016] |
©2016 | Series: Wisconsin studies in classics

Identifiers: LCCN 2015041518 | ISBN 9780299307509 (cloth : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D. Metamorphoses. | Ovid, 43
B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D.—Criticism and interpretation. | Ovid, 43 B.C.–17
A.D. or 18 A.D.—Technique. | Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D.—Influence.
| Repetition in literature. | Epic poetry, Latin—History and criticism.

Classification: LCC PA6519.M9 R47 2016 | DDC 873/.01—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015041518>

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
Introduction: Echoes of the Past LAUREL FULKERSON AND TIM STOVER	3
1 Nothing like the Sun: Repetition and Representation in Ovid's Phaethon Narrative ANDREW FELDHERR	26
2 Repeat after Me: The Loves of Venus and Mars in <i>Ars amatoria</i> 2 and <i>Metamorphoses</i> 4 BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD	47
3 Ovid's Cycnus and Homer's Achilles Heel PETER HESLIN	69
4 <i>Loca luminis haurit</i> : Ovid's Recycling of Hecuba ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS	100
5 Succeeding Succession: Cosmic and Earthly Succession in the <i>Fasti</i> and <i>Metamorphoses</i> DARCY KRASNE	125
6 Rape and Repetition in Ovid's <i>Metamorphoses</i> : Myth, History, Structure, Rome SHARON L. JAMES	154
7 <i>Metamorphoses</i> in a Cold Climate PETER E. KNOX	176

8	Ovidian Itineraries in Flavian Epic	196
	ALISON KEITH	
9	Revisiting Ovidian Silius, along with Lucretian, Vergilian, and Lucanian Silius	225
	NEIL W. BERNSTEIN	
10	Return to Enna: Ovid and Ovidianism in Claudian's <i>De raptu Proserpinae</i>	249
	STEPHEN HINDS	
	<i>Works Cited</i>	279
	<i>Contributors</i>	307
	<i>Index</i>	311
	<i>Index Locorum</i>	315

Preface

In this book we have, we hope, brought together some of the most exciting contemporary work on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. What unites the volume is a shared vision of the possibilities of Latin epic poetry, and a series of attempts to realize those possibilities. Some of the chapters explore traditional veins of allusion and intertextuality; others are more innovative in their approaches. Each chapter thus embodies a methodology of theorizing the repetitive practices of poetry, of epic, and of Ovid in particular. To capture some of the ambience of the conference in which this volume originated, including the varied authorial voices, chapters have been only minimally edited.

Thanks are due to the Langford Family Foundation for making the original conference possible, and to the Classics Department of Florida State University for its support of both the event itself and the editors. Thanks too to Stephen Fodroczi for help with the indices. Finally, Laurel would like to thank Megan Drinkwater and John Marincola (they know why!), and Tim thanks Amy Dill.

REPEAT PERFORMANCES



Echoes of the Past

LAUREL FULKERSON AND TIM STOVER

This volume combines two current areas of scholarship in Latin poetry. The first is the (traditional, but recently re-energized) study of intertextuality and intratextuality: the ways in which texts inevitably and sometimes self-consciously interact with other texts. The second is the growing interest in imperial poetry, and particularly the ways in which it negotiates the literature that has gone before. Each is a mature field in its own right, and Ovid stands at the intersection of the two. Previous generations' easy dismissal of Ovid's poetry, particularly for its (once tedious) repetitiveness, has been replaced by a much more nuanced appreciation of why and how Ovid and poets after him engage with their predecessors. Yet there has still been a fairly limited articulation of the poetics of repetition in Ovidian and post-Ovidian epic, the topic of this book.

Perhaps the most easily noticeable fact about the poet Ovid is that he repeats himself, both thematically (multiple treatments of the same mythological subject, but also multiple "takes" on a single narrative form, such as erotic didactic poetry or letters of erotic lament, or revisions of a single work) and lexically, via reuse of noteworthy phrases. So too, his consistent practice of referring to earlier poems, of nearly every kind, is a feature of his poetry that was once denigrated but is now eagerly explored. The former belief that Ovid's hyperactive repetitiveness was a sign of frivolity or lack of discipline or simple lack of originality has been replaced by scholarship that takes it seriously as a deliberate stylistic device, one that repays careful study in a multiplicity of ways.

We seek here to expand upon work that celebrates Ovidian repetition, juxtaposing a wide variety of forms of repetition, and also to illuminate some promising future directions for Ovidian scholarship. The chapters in this book focus on the *Metamorphoses* for several reasons. It is the poet's longest

sustained effort, so patterns of repetition may be expected to show themselves most clearly here. It comes roughly in the middle of his poetic production, so that it can both build on previous poems and foreshadow as-yet-unwritten ones. It is generally agreed to be the poet's masterpiece. It locates itself within a genre that valorizes repetition (see "Repetitive Genres" below). And it is itself structured as an extended narrative, comprising variations on a theme, and early on points out its own repetitive nature. Thus book 1 features not one but *two* creations of the world, and, as Darcy Krasne discusses in her chapter, later books continue the trend, while the poet also offers an object lesson, in the person of Argus, on the dangers of insensitivity to repetition at the reception point of literature.¹

In the political sphere, we might also ask what constitutes a repetition: a renaming as opposed to a revolution. The late Republic, when Ovid writes, is a time in which exactly this question is being asked on a much larger scale: the "refounding" of the Republic—in a form that evolves to become more or less unrecognizable—makes issues of definition of key importance. And the *Metamorphoses*, of course, thematizes change as perhaps the only constant, which is why it seems to have been such a fruitful source for later imperial poets, who were also seeking to understand the world around them as it repeated itself, with variations, under each new emperor.

The chapters in this book are concerned with the dynamic recycling of previous material and particularly with the effects produced by a text's repetitive gestures.² In this way they provide apt snapshots of two especially vital areas of Ovidian studies, that which concentrates on locating the poet within a larger poetic tradition of models and emulators, and also that which looks internally at how Ovidian narratives are structured. But we believe that they do more: we suggest that the various kinds of repetition we outline should be understood as a, perhaps even *the*, key feature of Ovidian poetics, techniques that encompass much of what makes Ovid Ovid. Beyond this, we suggest that Ovid's ways of repetition are seen by Latin poets of later generations as distinctive, even identifying, features of his craftsmanship, such that engaging in a particular kind of repetitive poetics becomes an intrinsically Ovidian practice. We flesh out these claims below.

A POETICS OF REPETITION

By its very nature, all literature is repetitive (indeed, a similar case has been made for nonliterary human speech, which tends to fall into certain stereotypical and characteristic patterns³). So it would be neither groundbreaking

nor even controversial to observe that Ovid treats themes that had already been treated, and, furthermore, that when he addresses themes treated by Latin authors, he sometimes does so with the very same words used by his predecessors. But this is a less interesting feature of Ovidian repetition. The contributors to this volume focus on poetic variants, the use of “famous” speeches and taglines in inappropriate contexts, and the avoidance of telling once-told stories. Repetition-with-variation, then, is our starting point for a number of reasons and on a number of fronts.⁴

We offer a brief discussion of some theories of repetition that we have found most useful for understanding Ovid’s repetitive practices, and then explain what we mean by “Ovidian repetition.” In literature, the critical models most commonly used to think about repetition are those of intertextuality (and intratextuality) and allusion. These differ in what they presume about authors and readers, and what they leave unsaid.⁵ But each makes clear that both large-scale and small-scale copying of a predecessor can have multiple motivations and can work in multiple ways. The most traditional paradigm of Latin poetry assumes a Bloomian model, whereby every repetition is at base an act of appropriative hostility, a would-be plagiarist’s attempt to replace the source-text in the world (Antony Augoustakis’s contribution to this volume might be seen in this light). In a slightly less confrontational model, the imitator is understood as wanting his theft to be discovered, because if he succeeds in eliminating his predecessor, his own work loses context. But there are more cooperative variants of copying, such as homage, parody, and pastiche, each with its own assumptions about the relative values of model and receiving text.⁶ There is also what we might call rescue, which entails a poet’s use of a lesser-known predecessor so as to bring him back into fashion. All of these categories of deliberate repetition of a predecessor might fall into Deleuze’s preliminary description of repetition as always either a theft or a gift.⁷ And there are, of course, further options.

Hierarchical models, whereby the “copier” implicitly admits his inferiority to those “copied,” depend upon the presumption that a repetition leaves the source-text unchanged; but they are not universal, especially in more recent work.⁸ So, for instance, while Ovid’s “avoidance” in the *Metamorphoses* of the incidents treated in Vergil’s *Aeneid* has often been read as an admission that he could not compete, there are many other ways of reading it (and these usually depend upon the interpreter’s view of the relative merits of the two texts). Vergil’s own notorious copying of Catullus 65.66 at *Aeneid* 6.460 is usually attributed to a desire to “go one better,” demonstrating both Vergil’s recognition of

the line as a good one and his ability to put it in a more effective location than his predecessor.⁹

We have thus far implicitly treated repetition as a conscious, deliberate act, but this need not be so (indeed, many of the debates of the 1980s and 1990s about intertextuality and allusion focused precisely on this question; see the bibliography at n. 5). While many of the contributors to this volume presuppose the model whereby an author looks at one text while crafting another, some allow for a more unconscious absorption of prior literature. And, of course, it is likely that all of the poets we discuss in this volume were extremely well versed in the literature of their predecessors, such that the distinction between purposeful imitation, remembrance of a pleasing phrase, and moments that feel like original poetic inspiration but are in fact intertextual must always be a matter of guesswork.

Finally, there is the category of self-repetition, which is not entirely different from intratextuality. This is an undertheorized practice, presumably because it is often explained as less than deliberate: an artistic act that involves (at best) forgetting the previous use of a memorable line, or haste in composition or revision. When this form of copying is understood to be the result of a deliberate choice, it has often been taken as a sign of various kinds of moral failing, reflecting a degenerate era, or the poet's own failing powers, or an unbecoming lack of humility. And this brings us to Ovid, who was early on accused of not knowing any better or even of knowing better but not caring (see the notorious Sen. *Controv.* 2.2.8–12 and Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.88). Those dark times are past, but copying from oneself continues to be viewed as a slightly suspect practice.

REPETITIVE GENRES

The *Metamorphoses*' claim to be an epic poem naturally gives it a particular standing among poetry. As an epic, it stands at the head of the genres, and epics have often been understood as gesturing toward totality, even if their actual subject matter is limited. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, for instance, are often taken as covering between them the two primary areas of human endeavor, war and peace. The *Aeneid*, at least in many contemporary interpretations, is similarly sophisticated, offering several attempts at peaceful relations followed by a new Trojan war in reverse. The narrative structure of the *Metamorphoses* is rather different, of course, presenting a chronological unfolding of the world from its first beginnings right down to the very recent past—and this is itself a bold claim of comprehensiveness: where other epic poets

had to start in medias res and be allusive, Ovid can cover it all! In a similar way, the *Metamorphoses* replicates many of the traditional structures of epic, but it also incorporates an often bewildering array of non-epic material.

Although repetition is discernible in all ancient literary genres, it is an especially pervasive feature of epic poetry, perhaps due in part to the length of most epic poems and the accompanying need for references backward and forward of a kind that repetition can well provide. More importantly, however, the originally oral nature of Homeric poetry means that repetition is its most obvious structural feature: from subject matter such as underworld visits, to “type scenes” of feasting or arming, to the repetition of epithets or individual lines, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are as much about how to tell a story as the story itself. Indeed, scholarship has shown that “Homer” himself is likelier to have come at the end of a long oral tradition than to have been an innovator. Although an originative element of epic in its oral stages, the practice of repetition tends to become even more deliberate as authors have increasing access to fixed texts, which they need not internalize in order to use.¹⁰ Beyond this, orally transmitted stories, or stories that, like the *Metamorphoses*, present themselves as orally transmitted,¹¹ inevitably vary over time, and perhaps thematize (fetishize?) their own ways of memorializing the past.¹² And Homer also prefigures his epigones by presenting a tension between belonging to a (repetitive) tradition and offering a “new song.”

Beyond specific moments of repetition, mythic narrative of the kind treated in epic and tragic poetry is especially susceptible to temporal manipulation (another area in which there has been much fruitful work done; see, e.g., Feeney 2007 and chapter 1, by Andrew Feldherr, in this volume). Because of its cyclic nature, latecomers can insert themselves before early birds in “narrative time” so as to complicate the straightforward relationship between imitated and imitator.¹³ (We might notice particularly the ways in which Ovid weaves in stories of metamorphoses from previous epics, especially Vergil’s, as a way to naturalize his own repetitive but innovative theme as traditional, and simultaneously to suggest that Vergil has not told the whole story.¹⁴) The fact that we move in only one direction in time, but narrative can move in many, means that “first” versions can always retrospectively be undermined. And this manipulability of mythic time is a feature that both Ovid and his successors capitalize upon: they can be conceived of as originators rather than copiers. Here, indeed, is one of many ways in which the *Metamorphoses* offers a sophisticated meditation on the nature of change itself.

OVIDIAN EPIC REPETITION:
TELLING THE SAME STORY AGAIN

The figure of Odysseus, who delighted his audience, “referre aliter saepe solebat idem” (*Ars am.* 2.128), is an important one for understanding Ovidian poetics, as he combines storytelling, seduction, and questions about how much power narrative has to affect the “real world.”¹⁵ Ovidian repetition falls, we suggest, into three basic categories: revision (of published work), recycling (of his own words), and reappropriation (of the work of others).¹⁶ Each of these is a well-recognized feature of Ovidian poetry, although we believe they have not before been juxtaposed in quite this way, nor has their similarity been sufficiently emphasized. The first, which we define as Ovid’s habit of offering “updates” of his own work, so that it is possible to read nearly all of his poetry as contingent rather than final, has recently been well treated by Francesca Martelli.¹⁷ Indeed, more than any previous poet, Ovid focuses our attention on his habit of revision: so much so that Ovidian chronology as a whole is difficult to determine precisely because he returns to previous work with such regularity. And, as Martelli (2013, 36) notes in a discussion of the *Amores*, Ovid’s consistent poetics of repetition suggests that the poet is himself the best “source-text” for serious study of his work. For our purposes in this volume, this is the least significant form of Ovidian repetition, since our authors primarily focus on the *Metamorphoses*—although it does help to explain Ovid’s role for later poets as the king of repetition; his insistent return to his own texts prefigures their later status as a treasure trove of poetic inspiration, and also suggests their openness to such acts of refashioning. The *Metamorphoses* presents itself as a more complete(d) text than much of the rest of the poet’s oeuvre, but, as Peter E. Knox’s chapter shows, it is revised in exile in a variety of ways.

Because we have a large sample of the poet’s work, composed over many years, we are also able to see Ovid’s successive treatment of particular themes and topics—his “recycling.” Recent work shows that this characteristically Ovidian reuse of both localized phrases and broader themes has the potential to “open up” the poetry, sometimes changing the original meanings of both the first instance and its later versions. We have already noted the general similarity of Ovid’s tales in the *Metamorphoses*;¹⁸ beyond this, he also has a habit of telling precisely the same story (i.e., with the same named, usually but not always mythic, characters) in different works. And there are further developments of these repetitive habits; among many excellent studies of this

nature, Alison Sharrock's 1994 book provides a theoretical underpinning for several of the chapters in this book. The repetition of particular words or lines features in this volume and is well treated throughout Ovidian scholarship;¹⁹ many of the explicit connections between passages have been comprehensively worked out. This volume's discussions of some less-noticed connections between passages and themes build upon previous scholarship and advance it. To recur to the Bloomian terms discussed above, Ovid's potential "anxiety of influence" is through the process of recycling merged into a form of self-rivalry, a game in which the poet wins either as the creator of an authoritative text that is not bettered by its later incarnation or as a bold innovator who alters the lens through which a previous text is understood (or sometimes both).

Finally, Ovid's own acquisitive habits, whereby he adapts the lines, scenes, or topics of other poets into his own text and makes them his own, are a feature of Latin poetry—and, as we have noted, of language as a whole. But we argue that Ovid does this so pervasively and so successfully that his practice becomes a model for the generations of epic poets who come after him. Later poets—even those usually not given much credit for competence at their craft, such as Claudian (see chapter 10, by Stephen Hinds)—recognize a particularly Ovidian brand of repetition, and engaging in similar poetic practices serves for them as an authenticating gesture. Before Ovid, poets copied one another; after Ovid, we believe, they do so with increased self-consciousness. If Ovid can be said to have cannibalized poetry, those who come after follow suit, using him as both theoretical justification and raw material.

ECHO: A CASE STUDY

These three formal categories of revision, recycling, and reappropriation, and variants upon them, all present in the *Metamorphoses*, suggest that the first-time reader's sense of an overwhelmingly repetitious narrative ("just one rape after another" is the summary that Sharon L. James's chapter takes as its starting point) is best taken as the result of a series of deliberate gestures, rather than the natural effect of including such a wide variety of material. The reader of the *Metamorphoses* is consistently challenged, through its repetitiveness, to find similarity-within-difference, difference-within-similarity.

Among many tropes of repetition available to the critic of the *Metamorphoses*, we offer a brief discussion of the tale of Narcissus and Echo (*Met.* 3.399–510) as emblematic of the poem's several views of repetition.²⁰ Much of the scholarship on the Narcissus and Echo tale concentrates—and for good reason—on the story it tells about the complicated nature of representation

and reality. This is, of course, a topic closely related to repetition, which always, at least implicitly, challenges the reader to make a judgment about the relative merits of two fairly similar items, which could be seen as masterpiece and copy or rough draft and finished product, or could have an even more complex relationship.²¹

We focus here on the practice of repetition itself as the story presents it. First, there is no evidence for any earlier juxtaposition of the story of Echo and the story of Narcissus, which means that Ovid may well have been the first to combine them.²² Such a doubling, as Barbara Stirrup (1976) notes, is only the first of many forms of structural repetition and revision that occur throughout the story.²³ Echo has been punished for her talkativeness by being deprived of the ability to initiate a conversation; she can only repeat what she has heard. But, as Ovid brilliantly shows, Echo is not doomed to passivity by this seeming limitation. Once she sees and falls in love with Narcissus, she is able to engage in a doubled language that (temporarily, at least) satisfies both herself and Narcissus, although he does not understand her intended meaning. The reader, for her part, is left to marvel at the disjunction between original utterance and (inevitably distorted, even when precisely identical) repetition (*Met.* 3.379–92):²⁴

forte puer comitum seductus ab agmine fido
 dixerat "ecquis adest" et "adest" responderat Echo.
 hic stupet, utque aciem partes dimittit in omnes,
 voce "veni!" magna clamat; vocat illa vocantem.
 respicit et rursus nullo veniente "quid" inquit
 "me fugis?" et totidem, quot dixit, verba recepit.
 perstat et alternae deceptus imagine vocis
 "huc coeamus" ait, nullique libentius umquam
 responsura sono "coeamus" rettulit Echo
 et verbis favet ipsa suis egressaque silva
 ibat, ut iniceret sperato brachia collo.
 ille fugit fugiensque "manus complexibus aufer;
 ante" ait "emoriari, quam sit tibi copia nostri."
 rettulit illa nihil nisi "sit tibi copia nostri."

By chance, the boy, led away from the familiar troop of his friends, had said: "Is anyone here?" and Echo had responded, "She is here." He is amazed, and as he seeks a vantage point in all directions, calls with a great voice, "Come!" and

she calls to him, calling. He looks back and forth and, since no one is coming, says, "Why do you flee me?" and as often as he spoke, he receives words in return. He stands still and, deceived by the sound of another voice, says, "Let's join up here," and Echo, never more eager to reply to anything, returned with her voice, "Let's join up," and burned at her own words and, coming out of the woods, she went to wrap her arms around that desired neck. He flees and, fleeing, says, "Take your hands from this embrace; may I die before what I have is yours." She returned only, "What I have is yours."

Like any artist-who-comes-after, Echo engages in a series of creative repetitions. Sometimes she offers alternative punctuation, sometimes she reproduces only the latter part of an utterance, and sometimes there is merely a difference of tone (these features will be both more and less obvious in the "original," oral version of their exchange). Each of her interventions necessarily changes Narcissus's meaning because her intent is wholly different. This is, at one level, simply a case of authorial reappropriation: Narcissus's words have literally been taken over by another, who uses them for her own purposes.²⁵ And (in spite of the regular critical perception that Echo has been effectively silenced) her skilled deployment of words makes it impossible to see her as merely the passive recipient of an influential source-text—just as impossible as it would be to suggest that her words could have existed without Narcissus's. The two sets of utterances together form a symbiotic entity that is subtly different from what either could have been on its own. Echo allows us to move beyond some of the unilateral understandings of repetition outlined above toward a more generous model. Her refashioning of Narcissus's words derives simultaneously from love *and* the desire to control, and displays both admiration for her predecessor *and* (selfish) arrogation of his speech.

Indeed, in a very Ovidian manner, Echo's subtle changes are so successful that, for some readers, she "contaminates" Narcissus's original words. Taken alone, his cries to his companions seem more innocent before Echo gets her voice on them, but once her smutty double entendres have been uttered, it is difficult to unthink them and disconnect them from the original text.²⁶ While Echo's talk is literally reappropriation, it is also, on Ovid's part, a kind of recycling. Beyond this, it is an attempt at conversation, which is another powerful model for intertextual relations. Echo, then, deserves attention as one of the much-discussed "artist figures" of the poem, each of whom refracts a different understanding of what poetry is and does.²⁷ From the vantage

point of hindsight, in light of Ovid's later life and exile, we can observe that Echo is sadly altered from what she had once been, punished for occupying an actively desiring subject position (Raval 2003), but *also* that the divine punishment was ultimately ineffective in silencing her; it merely changed the parameters under which she operated.²⁸ The form of her discourse has indeed been limited, but boundaries are not always bad: generic rules, for instance, compel and therefore free an author. It is clear that however much Echo's agency might seem constrained, she has no trouble communicating her message to Narcissus. So too, her continued sounding off—to this very day if you happen to be in the right place—is an exceptionally provocative revision of the old Ovidian story of the “silenced artist,” given that divine punishment in the *Metamorphoses* usually ends the conversation for good. At the same time, it takes both luck and skill to hear a poetic echo; there is so much we do not have, and we clearly do not always “hear” in the same ways the Romans did.

For Echo is described as both *vocalis* and *resonabilis* (“*vocalis nympha, quae nec reticere loquenti / nec prior ipsa loqui didicit, resonabilis Echo*,” “a verbally gifted nymph, who could not be silent when someone speaks, but cannot herself speak first, repeating Echo,” *Met.* 3.357–58; see Raval 2003, 205–8, and Natoli 2014, 78–82, both of whom see the terms as oppositional). For most readers, *vocalis* suggests some Edenic time of unfettered free speech; in our terms, this might be the period before artistic creativity is constrained by the knowledge of one's models (although there is never, in reality, such a period: all authors begin as readers). *Resonabilis*, by contrast, might describe her newly limited life, the poet's nearly inevitable reaction to the discovery of a Bloomian belatedness (silence being the only other option).

But this is surely too pessimistic. We do not get to hear her voice before the change, but Echo's effectiveness in sounding back ought to make us pause before assuming that there is a necessary disjunction between the two terms. Indeed, her forced relationship to extant language means that Echo's texts are now literally in dialogue with those that go before. What she lacks in originality, she gains in access to everything that has ever been said. So, too, her ability “reddere . . . verba novissima” (“to give back the most recent words,” 3.361) refers to her repetition of the end of an utterance but also has metapoetic implications: she can give new words to stale texts, making you see your words in new ways, and she can have the last word (see Barchiesi and Rosati 2007, ad loc.). In keeping with her epic milieu, she can also tell the most recent (version of a well-known) story.²⁹ Echo is an artist who works in the medium of “found items,” repurposing what had been there before into new and

sometimes unrecognizable forms. Echo and Narcissus offer different but parallel ways of understanding reality, competing interpretations of the story we already, by book 3, know all too well.

But Echo is, for many, only the prelude to the actual story (see Raval 2003, 204). After her rejection by Narcissus, she melts away into nothing but a sound, and is then able to voice Narcissus's own desire back to him and, incidentally, to offer further Ovidian insights into the pleasures and pitfalls of repetition. Narcissus is himself a primary example of visual repetition; he sees his own reflection, a mirror image of himself, but it is inevitably distorted. And his inability to see the full picture means that his call and response is necessarily deceptive (*Met.* 491–501):

et neque iam color est mixto candor rubori
 nec vigor et vires et quae modo visa placebant
 nec corpus remanet, quondam quod amaverat Echo
 quae tamen ut vidit, quamvis irata memorque
 indoluit, quotiensque puer miserabilis "eheu!"
 dixerat, haec resonis iterabat vocibus "eheu!"
 cumque suos manibus percusserat ille lacertos,
 haec quoque reddebat sonitum plangoris eundem.
 ultima vox solitam fuit haec spectantis in undam:
 "heu frustra dilecte puer!" totidemque remisit
 verba locus, dictoque "vale" "vale" inquit et Echo.

And no longer did he keep his color, whiteness with a blush mixed in, nor the force and strength which before, once seen, were pleasing, nor even his body remained, which once Echo had loved. When she saw this, although she was angry and still mindful of her pain, as often as the poor boy had said, "Woe is me!" she would repeat back with resounding voice, "Woe is me!" And when he had struck his shoulders with his hands, she gave back the same sounds of the beating. These were his final words looking in the well-known water: "Woe, boy loved in vain!" and the place rang out again with the words, and to his stated "Goodbye," Echo too said, "Goodbye."

Narcissus and Echo engage in stichomythia once, and then again, but (as often in tragedy) there is no real communication, although Echo has become more faithful in her re-representations now that Narcissus is playing her tune. Narcissus proves unable to master the disjunction between reality and image,

and it destroys him; we see in his dissolution some of the ways in which careless repetition can cause harm, but also the dangers of fetishizing one's own representations, of seeing oneself as a work of art.³⁰ By contrast, Echo's story can be read as the triumphant narrative of a woman who speaks in her own voice despite all odds. Or we might see a darker side to poetic emulation, understanding Echo's voice as able to resonate only with the annihilation of her model, and of her own body: creation is often also destruction. To what extent is an author responsible for the deformations she practices upon a predecessor? Can she survive the comparison?

On the other hand, Narcissus's stubborn resistance to any form of alien contact, his refusal to go along quietly with poetry's inevitable structures of appropriation and repetition, shows him to be less Echo's victim than a selfish artist (the poem makes clear that he richly deserves his sufferings), and his insistence on his own uniqueness ("puer unice," a unique boy, 3.454) becomes disrespect of all who have gone before.³¹ Narcissus provides a valuable lesson to those who focus exclusively on themselves: where Ovid revises and recycles his own work but also functions within a tradition, Narcissus cannot even see himself as connected to others. His statement "ante . . . emoriar, quam sit tibi copia nostri" (cited above) is not merely a foreshadowing of his own death but a counterexample to Ovid's own more lavish poetics: there is enough Ovid for everyone. Indeed, as even intermediate students of Latin know, an Ovidian line is eminently copy-able; rather than shutting himself off, Ovid welcomes interaction, inviting variation, modeling repetitive practices, and opening himself up to the revisions and *novissima verba* (most recent words) of those who come after him. "Tradition" and "originality," no longer terms of judgment, are refigured as conversation, perhaps even lovemaking.³²

However difficult it may be to move beyond the poet's fear of not measuring up or, alternatively, of destroying the model, Echo manages to avoid both. She masters her own distress and pain in order to pay homage to that which she has, however unwillingly, played a part in destroying. They are now, thanks to Ovid, Narcissus + Echo; two voices have turned into one, in a manner like the physical merging of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis in *Metamorphoses* 4 (a story often seen as "repeating" this one in theme and substance). In similar fashion, the epic poets who postdate Ovid once shared in the blanket condemnation of "Silver Latin"; they are now enjoying, in part thanks to their decision to practice an Ovidian poetics, their own renaissance.

Repetition, then, is not a detachable or accidental aspect of Ovid's poetry, to be either lauded or denigrated as critical fashions alter. Rather, it is what

makes the poet so distinctive, in our age as in previous times. As the following chapters show, engagement with Ovidian repetition also involves questions of poetic authority, ontology, cosmology, representation, succession, memory, desire, history, and the very structures of poetic language.

OVERVIEW

The chapters in this volume come at repetition from two angles. The first involves Ovid's "recycling" of his own material from one place to another in the *Metamorphoses* and elsewhere, and also the ways in which Ovid thematizes repetition as he borrows from others. The second approach considers later epic poets' use of the treasure trove of the *Metamorphoses*. These contributions make the case that Ovid's own habit of repetition established a paradigm for later, especially epic, authors' poetic practice, such that repetition itself can be figured as an Ovidian gesture. Although even a book many times as long as this one could not provide comprehensive coverage of Ovidian repetition, our hope is that these chapters, especially the later ones, will help to spread the Ovidian revolution to still-understudied texts by offering examples of the kinds of approaches that have proved most fruitful.

The volume opens with Andrew Feldherr's analysis of the richness and profundity of repetition in the Phaethon episode of *Metamorphoses* 2. Feldherr's elucidation of Phaethon reveals that for Ovid repetition and metamorphosis are structurally related. His reading allows the remarkably repetitive nature of the Phaethon narrative to emerge as a kind of programmatic *mise en abyme* for the repetitive and metamorphic poetics that characterize the epic as a whole. This chapter's foregrounding of repetition's profoundly programmatic status within the *Metamorphoses* allows it to function metapoetically for the present volume, which is devoted precisely to the ways and means of Ovidian repetition as elaborated initially in the *Metamorphoses* and the nature of its subsequent reception and reinterpretation in later texts.

Feldherr begins by (re)turning to the well-known ecphrasis on the doors of Sol's palace. As he gazes into the brilliantly self-reflective "mirror in the text" created by these doors, Feldherr demonstrates that Ovid's poetics of repetition is marked by such dizzying self-awareness that distinctions between representation and reality emerge as a fundamental element of Ovidian repetition. This analysis of the palace doors then becomes a portal, as it were, for exploring the Phaethon episode—and its repetitive gestures—as a problem of ontology. In so doing, Feldherr reveals that ultimately Ovidian repetition, far from being an inert mannerism or mere literary trope, is inextricably

connected to broader philosophical questions of truth and fiction, sameness and difference, continuity and change, art as creation and creation as art. Reading Ovidian repetition, then, is a process whereby we “build resemblance into meaning” and wrest “unity from opposition and boundless multiplicity.”

In chapter 2, Barbara Weiden Boyd complements Feldherr’s opening salvo by demonstrating that Ovidian repetitiveness is deeply implicated in broader issues of sameness and difference and therefore is crucial for our attempts to make sense of a poetics that so persistently employs repetition in order to advertise change and innovation. She focuses in particular on Ovid’s recycling in *Ars amatoria* 2 and *Metamorphoses* 4 of the love triangle of Hephaestus, Ares, and Aphrodite as recounted in *Odyssey* 8, a passage whose authenticity was often questioned by ancient critics of Homer.

Boyd’s analysis of the two Ovidian passages in light of their shared Homeric model reveals that Ovid’s penchant for repetition is a self-serving commentary of sorts on the Homeric material. Ovid’s reading of *Odyssey* 8 functions as a kind of literary criticism aimed at revealing the fundamentally Homeric nature of the story so that it can stand as exemplary for Ovid’s own poetic practices, which are marked by the kind of genre mixing and repetition discernible in the Homeric episode. Boyd thus demonstrates that Ovid’s desire to be seen as a latter-day Homer requires that the episode of Ares, Aphrodite, and Hephaestus in *Odyssey* 8 be deemed genuinely Homeric—as Ovid would define this term—because the self-conscious, ludic, and repetitive style that characterizes it gels so nicely with Ovid’s own poetic proclivities.

As Boyd shows, repetition itself signals *imitatio* of the Homeric style, thus allowing Ovid to fashion himself as an heir to Homeric tradition, albeit a wayward one. But it also allows Ovid to engage in *aemulatio* with his great epic predecessor, as he strives to outdo Homer at his own game. This act of poetic emulation entails repetition-as-change, as Ovid seeks to reveal how the Homeric material is susceptible to a seemingly endless process of renewal, and also how the meanings of the lessons conveyed by the Homeric episode undergo a process of reinterpretation for each new audience.

Ovid’s emulation of Homer and interest in Homeric authenticity also feature prominently in chapter 3, although here the focus is on the truthfulness or lack thereof of the *Iliad*’s narrator. Peter Heslin analyzes Ovid’s engagement with Homer’s *Iliad* in *Metamorphoses* 12, focusing especially on the episode in which Achilles defeats Cynus. Heslin shows that Ovid’s “sequel” to the *Iliad* prompts his audience to re-experience the Homeric poem in a new light because of Ovid’s undermining of the objectivity of the epic voice. Specifically,

Heslin argues that Ovid injects new information into the canonical Homeric narrative in order to suggest that the Iliadic narrative is “a self-serving lie, invented by Achilles and promulgated naïvely by Homer.”

Heslin reads the *Metamorphoses*’ account of Achilles’s battle with Cycnus as symbolic of Ovid’s emulous engagement with Homer. In so doing, he shows how Homer is cast (by Ovid) as the loser in his confrontation with Ovid. An important element of Ovid’s strategy here is to suggest that Homer was misinformed about Achilles’s vaunted invulnerability, suggesting instead that the hero did not possess any supernatural protection as a result of being dipped in the river Styx. Thus Ovid (re)constructs the battle between Achilles and Cycnus in such a way as to undermine the trustworthiness of Homeric narrative. His tendentious reading of Homer has interesting implications for anyone who returns to Homer’s narrative after experiencing Ovid’s subversive treatment. For example, Ovid’s questioning of Achilles’s invulnerability turns the famous description of Achilles’s shield into a digression on an irrelevant piece of equipment, “a Homeric red herring.” For a reader of Ovid, the *Iliad* will never be quite the same. This is so because in *Metamorphoses* 12 Ovid has undermined the authority of canonical epic by prompting the reader to repeat Homer’s narrative in the light of subversive, supplementary knowledge concerning Achilles’s invulnerability.

From Ovid’s engagement with issues of Homeric trustworthiness in the *Iliad* we move in chapter 4 to his recycling of a prominent Iliadic figure, namely Hecuba, the last queen of Troy. Antony Augoustakis analyzes Ovid’s representation of the Hecuba episode in *Metamorphoses* 13, a passage that turns on a sophisticated admixture of both epic and tragic modes. His study thus forms a nice complement to Boyd’s examination of how genre mixing and the recycling of Homeric material intersect earlier in the poem.

Like the authors of the previous chapters, Augoustakis shows how repetition signals change, as he elucidates its use to signpost the appropriation and renewal of traditional material for new ends. Here we see Ovid reusing material from both the epic cycle and tragedy in order to reposition the tragic Hecuba back in the world of epic, thereby re-energizing this figure and transforming her into a sign of the very processes at work in his repetitive and generically appropriative poetic program. Moreover, because Ovid’s recasting of Hecuba relies in part on his appropriation of the *Aeneid*’s famous finale, Augoustakis demonstrates that she comes to symbolize Ovid’s self-conscious engagement with his most important epic predecessor, Vergil, in whose text epic and tragedy are inextricably woven together.

The furiously irate Hecuba who gouges out her enemy's eyes becomes a powerful metaphor for the mutilation and deformation of literary tradition that Ovid's poetics of recycling entails. Consequently, Augoustakis reveals that poetic (re)creation is a (potentially) destructive process, an issue that comes to light also in Feldherr's reading in chapter 1 of the destruction wrought by Phaethon's wild ride. For Augoustakis, such notions are evocative for Ovid's reading of the *Aeneid*, a poem in which anger plays a pivotal role in the cycle of destruction and reconstruction that characterizes both epic and empire.

In chapter 5 Darcy Krasne examines the nature of Ovid's repeat performances in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, bringing fresh insights to a critical orientation that has a long and prestigious pedigree. She reads *Fasti* 5 in light of its remarkable number of connections not among the parts of the work but with the *Metamorphoses* and, even more specifically, with the broader framework of the *Metamorphoses*, from the origin of the universe to the glory of Rome.

Krasne begins with an analysis of *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 5 and the alternative cosmogonies—that is, variations on those with which each poem begins—contained in them. She demonstrates that each of these cosmogonies has the potential to replace or substitute for the “original” cosmogony that opens the *Metamorphoses*. Of particular interest within the cosmogonic framework of these passages is the motif of the Succession Myth, a narrative that is often present only implicitly (as in the phrase *Iove maius*, “greater than Jupiter”) or is brought to mind precisely because of its conspicuous absence from contexts where we would expect it to be more fully fleshed out. Krasne's focus on this “absent presence” complements Sharon James's discussion, in chapter 6, of the gradual disappearance of rape narratives in the *Metamorphoses*.

Krasne historicizes Ovid's careful and intricate presentation of the Succession Myth, regarding it as a commentary on the issue of political/dynastic succession at Rome. She shows that the motif of Jupiter ending succession on the divine level puts Augustus in a difficult position. In the mythological model, Jupiter willfully puts an end to succession, since any successor would be *Iove maius*, an unacceptable situation. Thus, for Augustus, as a double of Jupiter, to repeat the Jovian paradigm is troubling, since to repeat Jupiter's role in the myth of succession is to successfully terminate the dynastic line, to keep succession from being repeated.

Chapter 6 sees a continued focus on the intersection of myth and history and the role played by Ovid's poetics of repetition therein. Sharon L. James analyzes the insistent repetition of rape narratives in the *Metamorphoses* and

what these may tell us about the relations of Ovid's Roman readers to their own history and foundation legends. James investigates the experience of those readers as they made their way through the *Metamorphoses*, whose stories invoke their knowledge of other versions and of comparable episodes in other traditions, especially their own mythical history. She shows that the kind of rape narratives that characterize the early books of the epic, and that the reader comes to expect because of their remarkable repetition, should give way to something else: as Ovid's poem moves ever closer to his own day, we expect to read accounts of the various rapes that were foundational for Rome. This expectation is raised only to be frustrated. Ovid does *not* include such narratives: there is no Rhea Silvia, no Sabines, no Lucretia, and no Verginia. James suggests that the absence of such rape stories "amounts to a conspicuous presence, a blank spot in the reader's experience of the *Metamorphoses*."

Why does Ovid choose not to repeat the kind of story he has repeated so incessantly in the earlier books? James argues that as Ovid approached his own day and the history of his own city, the rapes—or attempted rapes—of women like Verginia seem "too real" and produce so much discomfort that Ovid avoids their explicit inclusion. In this way *lack* of repetition is a key to understanding part of Ovid's engagement with contemporary politics, a point that recalls Krasne's analysis of Ovid's handling of the Succession Myth in chapter 5. As James shows, the erasure of these narratives gels with the attempt by Augustus to brand as illegal the kinds of acts witnessed over and over again in the early books. Some stories—and acts—should *not* be repeated. And given their connection to Rome's foundation, Ovid's poetic choices here take on a political dimension, since Rome's foundation is currently being repeated with the "refoundation" of the *res publica* under Augustus. For Ovid and his contemporaries, it remains to be seen just what kind of repetition of the past this political reboot will entail: what of the familiar will be recycled, and what will be omitted, thereby becoming conspicuous by its absence?

In chapter 7 Peter E. Knox tackles Ovidian repetition from yet another angle. He examines the manner in which Ovid recomposes his own earlier work in his exile poetry and the effects of these repetitive maneuvers on those who come (back) to those earlier texts after encountering their reception in Ovid's exilic corpus. Thus, Knox takes aim at a kind of auto-reception that is carried out through both lexical and thematic forms of repetition—that is, by a kind of self-reflexive intertextuality. He demonstrates that Ovid's recycling of his earlier works alters our understanding of them, compelling us to re-interpret them in light of the new "spin" that Ovid puts on them. Verbal echoes

function as the definitive markers of this type of revision, but, as Knox shows, it is above all the context of any given repetitive gesture that reveals whether or not it constitutes an overhaul of perspective on the prior text.

So, for instance, by recycling in *Tristia* 1.7 the story of Althaea and Meleager as told in *Metamorphoses* 8, Ovid “revises” the essential meaning(s) of the tale. What was originally a story about a woman’s competing sympathies concerning the lives of her brothers and the life of her son is converted into a narrative primarily about Ovid’s relations to his own poetic material. As a result, any subsequent reading of the passage in *Metamorphoses* 8 is tinged with this new (re)interpretation. Althaea now figures Ovid, and the episode becomes retroactively evocative of Ovid’s exilic desire to burn his own texts, to destroy the thing he created. This is so, Knox notes, because that creation has led to his own demise in exile, as the creative act has ultimately turned out to be destructive—a notion of some importance for the analyses of both Feldherr and Augoustakis as well. Thus, by way of this process of self-reflexive repetition, Ovid’s exile poetry triggers the metamorphosis of his earlier metamorphic poetry.

Knox’s analysis forms a bridge to the final group of chapters, as we move from Ovid’s reception of his own previous work to the reception of the *Metamorphoses* in later Latin epic. As is often the case, Ovid here too prefigures his successors by explicitly setting up the *Metamorphoses* as a text to be imitated. And as the following chapters make clear, subsequent epic poets were eager to follow his lead.

In chapter 8 Alison Keith focuses on the repetition of Ovidian material in the poems of Valerius Flaccus’s *Argonautica*, Statius’s *Thebaid*, and Silius Italicus’s *Punica*. Keith maps the contours of the reception of the *Metamorphoses* in the epic poetry of the late first century CE, a time that is inescapably post-Ovidian as well as post-Vergilian, a point that Stephen Hinds’s chapter 10 also places in high relief. In particular Keith examines the recycling of Ovidian myths in the epics of the Flavian era in order to analyze their recuperation of Ovidian themes in the reworking of some of his most famous mythical narratives.

Keith shows, for example, that Valerius’s description of the painting on the Argo’s hull, a passage of great programmatic significance, reveals that this *Argonautica* explicitly positions itself as an epigone of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, especially with regard to its treatment of mytho-poetic material concerning the Argonautic expedition. We are therefore alerted early on to be cognizant of Valerius’s repetition of Ovidian loci. Similarly, Keith demonstrates that

from the very outset of the *Thebaid*, Statius advertises the importance of Ovid's treatment of Theban royal history in his account of the House of Cadmus for his own treatment of the House of Oedipus. Keith offers particularly rich discussions of Statius's frequent reversion to a "Cadmean paradigm" of exile and bestial transformation that derives from Ovid's treatment of Theban myth in the *Metamorphoses*: as "his characters travel through the topography of Ovid's Theban narrative, so Statius traverses a series of Ovidian mythological *topoi*." Her discussion of Silius's sustained allusion to Ovidian mythmaking in *Punica* 11, where Hannibal and the Carthaginians attend a luxurious banquet modeled on the one given by Dido for Aeneas in *Aeneid*, book 1, reveals that Silius's engagement with Ovid tends not to deform or ironically subvert Silius's Vergilian vision, but rather to supplement and enrich it. Here too we see that Ovid's *Metamorphoses* suggests various models of repetition for his epic successors.

Neil W. Bernstein focuses on the repetition of verbal complexes from the *Metamorphoses* (and other texts) in Silius Italicus's *Punica* and thus (like Keith and Hinds) addresses the reception of Ovidian material in subsequent poetry. Bernstein's contribution is unique in this collection for its use of an emerging technology with exciting possibilities for the study of verbal repetition and intertextuality: namely the program developed by the *Tesserae* project (see tesserae.caset.buffalo.edu). Using this freely available software, Bernstein assembles both quantitative and qualitative data to test the hypothesis that "Silius repeats complete phrases and word collocations less frequently than other Latin epic poets, with a focus on repetition from Ovid."

Bernstein's quantitative results spanning the entire epic are complemented by a narrower qualitative analysis of Silius's repetitive gestures in book 2 of the *Punica*. This allows Bernstein to reveal the manner in which Silius juxtaposes allusion to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* with allusion to other epic poets in order to place the Ovidian intertexts into a broader context. This examination demonstrates that use of *Tesserae* provides the "materials for discovery rather than comprehensive interpretations," similar to the way in which a *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL) article offers paths for future research but does not provide a specific reading or set of readings. Bernstein makes a strong case that as we continue to track the intricacies of Roman poets' repetitive gestures, *Tesserae* should become an instrument as fundamental as TLL, Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), and the standard grammars. This is so because through its applications in quantitative as well as qualitative analysis, *Tesserae* assists both close readers studying the use of a single phrase and the

“distant’ or macroanalytic reader” attempting to uncover patterns across the entire literary corpus.

In chapter 10 Stephen Hinds returns to Enna, the site, as it were, of his watershed reading of Ovidian poetics in 1987. Here he demonstrates that Claudian’s *De raptu Proserpinae* is an epic that “can fairly be called post-Ovidian, both in general aesthetic and in specific adoption of a twice-told myth from *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.” Like Keith and Bernstein, therefore, Hinds seeks to analyze the reception of Ovid in later poetry, and specifically to reveal the extent to which the repetition of Ovidian themes, imagery, phraseology, and aesthetic principles permeates Claudian’s epic world.

Hinds’s analysis explicitly seeks to rehabilitate Claudian’s epic and ameliorate the poet’s unfair image problem in the eyes of most Latinists, and to do so specifically within the thematic parameters of the present volume—that is, rehabilitating Ovidian repetition. For as Hinds notes, “the poetry of Claudian is still more likely to be faulted, in the old way, for being (simply) ‘too repetitive.’”

In particular, Hinds focuses on a key locus of contact between Claudian’s and Ovid’s versions of Persephone, namely the geographical location of the rape, Enna. His return to this supercharged poetic landscape takes many twists and turns, involving the geography of Sicily, landscape ecphrasis, and, perhaps most interestingly of all, textual criticism. Hinds arrays this material in order to offer a case study whose primary aim is to read the *De raptu Proserpinae* as a text that knows how to employ repetition as a force for artistic good. An important factor in Claudian’s approach to the aesthetic merits of repetition is his self-conscious responsiveness to the repetitive poetics on prominent display in Ovid’s (repeated) Persephone narratives in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

NOTES

1. See Konstan 1991 for explication of this point in narratological terms.
2. On the level of diction, see Wills 1996, a magisterial study of repetitive language, and Heyworth 2013 on the repetitive syntactical gestures used by Propertius to emphasize that (his) elegy is always telling the same old story.
3. On the repetitiveness of “I love you” and other such unique-but-formulaic utterances, see Barthes 1978.
4. See especially Sharrock 1994b, which is interested in subtle variants between books 1 and 2 with respect to the repetitive process of falling and staying in love.
5. Variations in the understanding of intertextuality within Latin poetry are many. Hinds (1998) and Edmunds (2001), each building in different ways upon the shorter

treatments in Conte 1986 and Thomas 1986, have framed the subsequent debate within classics (both offer ample further references). See also Allen 2000 for a helpful introduction to the topic, with an overview of its various strands.

6. See Peirano 2012 for helpful revision of the model by which “*spuria*” are often read. Peirano argues that we need not imagine a forger deliberately seeking to deceive.

7. Deleuze 1994. Deleuze’s work as a whole seeks to undermine these distinctions.

8. See Brenkman 1976.

9. Both Ovid’s “*Aeneid*” and Vergil’s use of the line from the *Coma* have generated vast bibliographies. For extensive discussion of the latter, see Pelliccia 2010. See also Smith 1997 for discussion of a less hostile, Buberian approach to the use of a predecessor (in his case, mostly Ovid or Vergil), which Smith terms “poetic embrace.”

10. Here again, the bibliography is enormous and the stakes high. For some helpful recent entries, see Edwards 1992, Minchin 1995, Clark 2004, and Bakker 2013, 157–69, on “interformularity.”

11. Most fully argued in Wheeler 1999.

12. Recent work on Fama, most particularly Hardie 2012, 150–77 (on her appearance in the *Metamorphoses*), and 178–225 (on her inevitability in later epic), is exceptionally relevant here; see also chapter 3 in this volume, by Peter Heslin.

13. For this practice in Ovid, see Barchiesi 1993; for Valerius Flaccus, see Zissos 2002.

14. This is itself already a Vergilian gesture; Ovid innovates by suggesting the theme of metamorphoses as a hidden key to both Homer’s and Vergil’s narratives.

15. Sharrock 1994b offers fuller explication of the issues discussed in this section.

16. For further discussion of these three forms of repetition, see Fulkerson 2016. We have left it to each contributor to choose his or her theoretical terms. In this introduction we offer “reappropriation” as a compromise between the author-centered and perhaps not serious enough “allusion” and the broader “intertextuality,” which for some leaves obscure precisely what process is being described.

17. See Martelli 2013. On the poetics of revision in general, see Gurd 2012.

18. In addition to Konstan 1991, see Nagle 1988 and Farrell 1992 for some influential treatments of groups of similar episodes in the poem.

19. See, most innovatively, Ahl 1985, a groundbreaking study of the manipulation of letter-clusters in the *Metamorphoses* to connect episodes across the poem.

20. See Pellizer 1988, 107–9, for a convenient summary of different versions of the tale of Narcissus, and Hollander 1981, 7–8 and 13n5, for useful thoughts on Echo’s mythography. Wieseler 1854 and 1856 offer full treatment of Echo and Narcissus in mythology, and Vinge 1967 provides a detailed study of the use of the Narcissus theme in later works. Fabre-Serris (1995, 183) draws attention to the way Ovid’s version alters the two myths in collocating and repeating them. Most discussions among classicists base themselves, knowingly or not, on the slightly dated remarks of Fränkel (1945, 82–85), which emphasize the dangers of self-absorption.

21. On Ovid's reappropriation of Lucretius in this episode, see Hardie 1988; Ovid's theft of (the already multivocalic) Catull. 62.44 at *Met.* 3.353, and of the repetitive Verg. *Ecl.* 3.79 at *Met.* 3.501, is well discussed in the literature; see especially Hinds 1998, 5–8. On Ovid's interest in representation and its relationship to reality, see Rosati 1983 and Hardie 2002; for both, Narcissus is a key figure for the artist/illusionist. We see Echo as an artist more genuinely reflective of Ovidian principles (hints in Loewenstein 1984, 55; see n. 27 below).

22. See Bömer 1969, ad loc., for discussion.

23. See Stirrup 1976 for extended discussion of the point. Stirrup treats the duality of both parties (each is both an original and a copy), formal parallels in the description of each, and their duplicated speech patterns. Loewenstein (1984, 45) well describes the entwined tales as “chiasmus writ large.” So too, G. Davis's emphasis on Narcissus as “in a truly substantive sense, a ‘male nymph,’” points to their essential similarities (Davis 1983, 84). Bonadeo (2002) notes that echoic language is an important feature of ritual lament: this repetitive tale could never have had a happy ending.

24. Text from Barchiesi and Rosati 2007; the translations are ours.

25. In this regard, Hollander's notion of transumption/*metalepsis* is especially useful (see Hollander 1981). But note that Echo may not be engaging in deliberate misrepresentation; in repeating Narcissus's words as she does, she merely reflects her own understanding of what they do/should mean (see Berger and Gabara 1996, 632). Perhaps, then, Echo is merely one example of the distortions of interpretation.

26. Note especially in this context the notorious *coeamus*, which was never a wholly appropriate way of saying “let's meet up.”

27. See most recently P. Johnson 2008 and Pavlock 2009; neither treats Echo (though Pavlock interestingly examines Narcissus as a failed elegiac poet). Rimell (2006), by contrast, focuses precisely on the gendered treatment of artists and representation within the poem; Narcissus is for her best paired with Medusa. Barchiesi and Rosati (2007, ad loc.) make brief mention of Echo's creative status; Hardie (1988, 89) suggests that we might take Echo as a figure for Ovid's treatment of Lucretian optics, “picking up the words and themes of the earlier poet and making of them *sua verba*.” Raval (2003) examines her as a skilled storyteller, punished for her arousing subject matter. Hollander (1981), Loewenstein (1984), and Knoespel (1985) concentrate on later poetic invocations of Echo, which show their power to captivate and to encapsulate the classical tradition, seen as a source-text for allusion as a whole. Hollander (1981) sees Echo/echo as a figure of *différance*, intruding into texts to show their joins with other texts. Berger and Gabara (1996, 621) draw attention to the version of Echo's story in *Daphnis and Chloe*, which represents her as a “student” of Pan, replaying his music.

28. See Natoli 2014, chap. 2, on speech loss in the *Metamorphoses* (his reading of Echo, pp. 77–84, is somewhat more pessimistic than the one we present here).

29. We might also pay attention in this regard to *Met.* 3.366–68 on her “potestas parva” (“slight ability”) and “vocisque brevissimus usus” (“very brief usage of speech”)

as a restatement of—and triumph over—the elegists' standard claim that they simply cannot master the big voice needed for epic.

30. See Bettini 1999, 94–108, focusing on the dangers of loving images, and Hardie 2002, 146, on falling in love with one's own creations. Narcissus is, of course, by no means the only Ovidian figure who poses such questions.

31. The solipsistic nature of Narcissus, and its status as a perversion, is most regularly highlighted in psychoanalytic readings; see Nouvet 1991 and Spivak 1993, building in rather different ways upon Freud's, Derrida's, and Kristeva's influential takes on the myth. See Fabre-Serris 1995, 187–88, with notes, for further bibliography and categorization of some of the main approaches. Narcissus has been taken by some as a figure for Ovid; we see the merits of this reading but insist upon it as only one of many models.

32. See Gordon Williams 1968, a pioneering and still important study that, nonetheless, could not escape the critical prejudices of its time. On repetition as conversation, see the extremely illuminating remarks of Tarrant 1989 on interpolations in a poetic text by a later author; he observes that the most frequent kind is done in a collaborative vein, "an imaginative response which enhances, amplifies, or heightens the text, and here the reader's role can fairly be described as that of a co-author" (126). He attributes the practice, in part, to the ways in which Latin poets themselves privilege "rhetorical" techniques, which encourage expansion and competitive emulation (158). Janan (2007, 293), in discussing this phenomenon, notes that through later readers and poets, Ovid becomes "the Platonic ideal of his Silver-Latin self."

Nothing like the Sun

Repetition and Representation in Ovid's Phaethon Narrative

ANDREW FELDHERR

As the first episode of the second book, the Phaethon story would seem an inevitable place to explore the thematic significance of repetition in Ovid's epic.¹ The narrative also begins as the doublet of a story that has already been told: as so often, what had seemed a unique and miraculous event—Jupiter's rape of Io—turns out to be an all-too-common occurrence. Verbal repetition even features within the story as the initial catalyst for action when Phaethon arouses the contempt of Jupiter's son Epaphus by reporting the account of his own parentage that he has heard from his mother ("matri . . . omnia . . . credis," *Met.* 1.753–54) and then repeating Epaphus's insults back to his mother in turn (1.756). His subsequent quest to prove the truth of his identity involves not one but two journeys, one taking him from earth to his celestial origins, the other from the sky back down to his death. That ride through the sky also involves repetition on Ovid's part, since narrating the story demands revisiting figures that have just been described as visual images on the doors of the Sun's palace or in the god's own prediction of the hazards of the route. And Phaethon's first journey leads to the second through an act of verbal echoing. When Phaethon exploits his father's promise to grant any wish by asking for the chance to drive the chariot of the Sun, he appears to have practiced a kind of intratextual appropriation: "temeraria" dixit / 'vox mea facta tua est," laments his father (2.50–51). "My voice has been made rash by your own."

However, once one has been sensitized to look for repetition, it begins to appear on so many levels and to bear so much meaning as to defy interpretation. To Robert Brown (1987), the replaying of the acts of creation in book 1 as a prelude to their cosmic destruction in book 2 suggests an Ovidian preference

for a reality based on flux and transformation to the instantiation of order presented by the first glimpse of the Sun's palace. The figure of the mortal offspring failing to follow in his father's footsteps suggests a Bloomian anxiety of influence on the part of Ovid as a successor poet whose distinctiveness comes precisely from the disorder he brings to the epic tradition. Political interpretations of the declension from divine father to human son have also emerged, with Phaethon seen sometimes as a figure for Augustus, proving his mortality in a hubristic attempt to order the world, sometimes as Gaius, whose fate tragically undermines the dynasty's efforts to perpetuate itself.² The episode is also among the most radiantly abundant examples of wordplay in the poem, as Frederick Ahl (1985, 167–200) demonstrates. Almost all of these readings are persuasive: nor are they mutually exclusive. But the very proliferation of correspondences between the Phaethon story and other elements within the poem and in the context of Augustan culture creates its own problems of reading. The multiplication of meanings can unify all the different phenomena the narrative describes as manifestations of metamorphic principles at work in the human world. But it can also become a strategy to evade meaning anything at all, as the political becomes aesthetic and vice versa.

My own interest in re-examining this episode is to show how it comments on the hermeneutic consequences of repetition itself. Repetition in general functions as a kind of verbal metamorphosis capable of simultaneously suggesting sameness and difference. I argue that the Phaethon story highlights repetition as a crucial aspect of the semiotics of Ovid's poem, predicting the very ambiguities that attend its reception. Repetition approximates on the level of the poem's form the function of metamorphosis within its content: it invites the reader to compare and contrast two manifestations of the same thing and to seek out continuities and changes. The relationship between textual repetition and metamorphic subject matter becomes particularly close in the Phaethon episode, since Phaethon himself will be transformed into a text, the epigram on his tomb, which itself repeats the story Ovid has told.³

As a preliminary example of the ambiguities opened up by repetition, consider that solar complaint: "*temeraria vox mea facta tua est.*" Its obvious reference is to the way in which the intervention of Phaethon as a character in the story has changed the significance and consequences of the Sun's vow. But wordplay tightens the connection between this turning point in the plot and the simple semantic change that comes about with imperfect repetition. For not only is the Sun the structural center of the episode, around which all repetitions orbit,⁴ but he also governs the cosmos described within the narrative.

Clymene swears to Phaethon that he is the son of the Sun “who governs the world” (“qui temperat orbem,” 1.770). Yet Phaethon’s own disobedience rebuts both of these traditional claims—the Sun here is emphatically not in control.⁵ For “temperat,” read “temeraria.” And at stake in this change is the larger question of whether the Sun still remains the same. Does Ovid’s story change the way we see the Sun, or does the consistency of the Sun demote Ovid’s story of an anthropomorphized negligent father to the realm of fiction?

ECPHRASIS AS REPETITION

My argument begins with a moment on which the repetitive aspects of the tale seem to hinge: the ecphrasis of the sculptural program on the doors of the Sun’s palace. As various analyses have shown, particularly Brown’s, this passage itself constitutes a repetition of the account of the creation of the cosmos in book 1 and an anticipation of Phaethon’s own destructive romp through the ordered universe it depicts. This mirror in the text serves to bring under the umbrella of repetition another relationship already anticipated in the parallels between textual recurrence and metamorphoses: that between representation and reality.⁶ Ideally, reality ought to be prior to representation: something has to exist before it can be imitated. The world has been created in book 1, and the repetition of a description of the ordered cosmos here marks the second stage of a process, more artificial and more distant from reality. However, when Phaethon enters a cosmos of celestial bodies in human form that seemingly matches that described in the image, there is an inclination to reverse the priority of the two. The correspondence between the vivified images Phaethon will encounter and the sculpted picture of the universe perhaps results not from Mulciber’s having depicted the world as it is but from the artificial creation governing what this artificial poem constructs as reality, and what the unfortunate visitor who literally enters the picture by walking through the door of representation will experience as true.

Before proceeding to analyze the implications of this issue, I offer some justification for reading the scene as a problem of ontology. Not only does the text explicitly link Phaethon’s journey to the Sun with a search for truth about his parentage, in language that relates the issue both internally to the status of Ovid’s poetic fictions (*ficta*, *Met.* 1.771) and to the function of *fabulae* about divine origins to establish political authority at Rome (cf. Livy, *praef.* 6–7), but it offers visible signs as proof of the veracity of stories.⁷ Phaethon asks his mother for the *signa* of his true parent (*Met.* 1.764), suggesting both signs and statues, and she backs up her vow with an oath by the visual radiance of the

Sun. But an intertext looming in the background of the entire episode also points the reader toward such metaphysical questions: Plato's *Phaedrus*. When young Phaethon "burns with desire" (*Met.* 2.104) for the winged horses of the Sun and rejects his father's advice, it is already all too easy to read the winged chariot, of which he will make himself such an ineffectual part, as a metaphor for his own disordered soul.⁸ While the *Phaedrus* myth offers no one-to-one correspondence with the story that follows, a number of general similarities support the connection. Most importantly, the desire that prompts the soul to grow wings is ultimately a desire to return to its origins, which are in the sky. Specifically, the soul aspires to recapture the glimpses it gained in the divine procession of "real reality" ("ousia ontos ousa," Plato, *Phdr.* 247c7). Beyond these reasons for thinking of Phaethon's quest for his father as a parallel to the soul's desire to see the truth, another deserves attention on the grounds of its very superficiality: the name *Phaethon* recalls the title of the dialogue *Phaedrus*. Again similarities of content are suggested by a similarity of signs, as though they bore an intrinsic relation to what they signified.

When we view the Sun's palace as the goal of a search for truth, how does that help us characterize the images we find there? To answer that question, I want to consider the account of Mulciber's statues as a repetition of the account of cosmic creation in book 1. As Brown (1987, 215–16) and Wheeler (2000, 37–40) have both stressed, the ecphrasis in book 2 repeats language from book 1's account of the ordering of the world. We can create an "orderly" relationship between the two passages by reading the second simply as a sequel, an imitation of a real act of creation, as the image is a representation of the cosmos. But if we take the first sentence of the ecphrasis literally, Mulciber simultaneously sculpts an image of the world and the world itself (2.5–7):

nam Mulciber illic
aequora caelarat medias cingentia terras
terrarumque orbem caelumque quod imminet orbi.⁹

For Mulciber had there sculpted seas girding the lands in their midst and the circle of the lands, and the sky which hangs over that circle.

What we have is less a recapitulation of the earlier creation than a repetition of it, a new world with a new author. An earlier argument of Wheeler's (1995) allows one to deepen the point of this confusion in relation to Ovid's own act of representation. The original scene of creation in book 1 imitates the

ecphrasis of the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad*. By recasting creation as ecphrasis, Ovid in literary terms actually moves the account of creation closer to its original while at the same time making the image of the world seem even more distant from reality.¹⁰ It is now the copy of a cosmic creation that was itself only the copy of Homer's representation of Hephaistos's representation of the world. By contrast, this creation by the same god appears as temporally prior to the works whose descriptions provide Ovid's literary models, the actual shields of Achilles and Aeneas. The very act of repetition thus magnifies the confusing hermeneutic potential of the first creation to present creation as artifice or artifice as creation. The competition Ovid signals at the beginning of the ecphrasis between the *opus* and its raw material (*materiam*, 2.5) may thus be transferred to the larger relation between artistic representation and matter itself.¹¹

A closer look at the initial line of the ecphrasis further confirms how the act of repetition makes the ecphrasis seem to underline or undo the process of ordering the cosmos that provides the work's own origins. As I suggested, the line raises the question of whether Mulciber sculpts merely an image of the seas or the seas themselves. The word *caelarat* extends the ambiguity from Mulciber's visual image to Ovid's verbal representation of it, for the first syllable of that verb evokes the sky, the third cosmic element whose separation was the first stage of the actual genesis narrative in the previous book (1.22). Thus Ovid's line in itself becomes a sort of icon of words, designating the elements whose distinction makes his narrative possible. (And my phrase "actual genesis" already suggests how this act of repetition adds a retrospective authenticity to that earlier scene.) In his note on *caelarat*, Alessandro Barchiesi (2005, 239) cites Andreas Michalopoulos's (2001, 45) observation that ancient etymologies make the verb *caelare* come before the noun: the sky is called the *caelum* because it is "chiseled" with stars (Varro, *Ling.* 5.18–19). Thus recasting the origin of the world as an act of artistic creation actually brings one closer to the truth about the sky. However, to use the verb *caelarat* of the sea similarly points to the image as confusing the elemental clarity emerging from the ordering of Chaos in book 1. Mulciber has, so to speak, "skied the sea," just as he will conversely imprison blue "sky" gods within the waters. Similarly that Ovidian verbal image suggesting the cosmic divisions of sky, sea, and earth also puts them in confusion by weaving the elements and their modifiers together. The lands (*terras*) are described as in the middle (*medias*), but they actually come at the end of the line. And since the new designation here of the sea as *aequora* (as opposed to *mare*) deploys a word

that earlier in the epic tradition also denotes terrestrial plains, in the Ovidian icon it is the land that seems to surround the sea. From this perspective the repetition of the creation through imitation already seems to confuse the divisions of the cosmos just as much as Phaethon's later ride will do.¹² Whether we see Ovid's original act of creation as a mere artificial imitation or as creating a cosmos in turn, as moving closer to the real or away from it, thus depends on how we read the sequence whose next point we track in its repetition here. The very act of narrating the creation of the cosmos again creates these two divergent possibilities. Repetition here corresponds to a move down or up the chain that leads from reality to representation. Does the representation of the world appear as fundamentally veristic, authenticating, and ordering, or does it bring a chaotic proliferation of alternative worlds, with each claiming to be original? An important question to ask as the poet begins the second book of a poem, which can seem either to continue the first or mark a new start.

The very positioning of the ecphrasis as a repetition within the narrative suggests these alternative views of its relation to the real cosmos. But within the ecphrasis itself, different problems of representation are raised whose significance reaches outside the bounds of the image to affect our understanding of the narrative within which it is described. Ovid's presentation of the sculptures, thanks to the linear medium within which he works, gives a trajectory, a beginning and end, which the synchronic image on its own would lack, and this trajectory incorporates a motion from the divine to the human that will be redoubled in Phaethon's transit from sky to earth. It also correlates this narrative path with a structural opposition between two antithetical representational challenges. The sea gods at the beginning of the ecphrasis form a series of visually miraculous hybrids whose mixed forms recall not only Horatian aesthetic prohibitions but simultaneously the chaotic possibilities of the entire ecphrasis. Their alarming visual quality of blueness, *caeruleos*, simultaneously designates their displacement from sky to sea. However, for all their incredibility as real beings, they are extremely familiar as objects of representation, adorning everything from the Pergamon altar to luxury furniture.¹³ It is thus easy to conceptualize the image, but hard to imagine a reality to which it corresponds. To focus on but one such figure, if it is the nature of Proteus to change his shape, how can any image show what he really looks like? This Protean problem of containing multitudes in one emerges again as the ecphrasis gathers narrative momentum in moving from the first to the second generation (again matching the position of the ecphrasis within

Ovid's narrative, as we move from the divine rapes of book 1 to the encounters between their offspring): the daughters of Doris can be depicted neither with one similar image nor yet with entirely different ones. Their multiformity has a double aspect: like the gods who come before, each is individually made up of incongruous parts combining the terrestrial and the aquatic, but collectively they present a problem of distinguishing each individual in a multitude.¹⁴ The ambiguity contained within a single image becomes the problem of measuring similarity and difference in a series of related images. The god probably has been able to render each of these hundred not-entirely-likenesses on the sculpture itself, but the poet can only generalize. But consider what comes next. The earth "bears" cities, men, and so on. The tense of *gerit* is important (2.15). It is both an ecphrastic present conveying the timelessness of the depicted image and also a reference to a process that continues in the real world even now. Doris has borne her daughters, and the craftsmen can represent them. But the earth keeps on bearing. It would be hard enough to depict all the figures on the earth, but iconic representation becomes impossible when we add the dimension of time. The image cannot show all the multiplicity the earth is producing, as she goes on producing it. The ecphrasis thus takes us from an image that can be easily envisaged, but whose real referent cannot exist, to the actuality of human experience, which, however, cannot be figured in an image. The quality of numerical repetition is allied with temporal progress, and these two markers of the narrative's motion from divine origins to human reality also drive the process here.

In Brown's analysis of the description of the Sun's Palace, he evokes the tapestry scene at the beginning of book 6 as a comparable articulation of different aesthetic, indeed metaphysical, tendencies of the poem as a whole.¹⁵ Brown suggests that the emphasis given to the Protean sea gods within the ecphrasis here reveals the poet's own distortion of the actual image created by the divine artist and thus imposes a "counterclassical" aesthetic on this highly ordered work. In addition to the opposed views of nature as static or in flux and the contrasting aesthetic priorities between the classical and the counterclassical, both highlighted by Brown, the trajectory of mimetic dilemmas traced in the ecphrasis blends representational and theological questions in a manner that anticipates the later confrontation between goddess and mortal artist: the struggle between Chaos and order becomes a battle between our direct experience of the world and its crafted representation in Ovid's poem, with two alternative authenticating strategies undermining one another. Minerva's tapestry shows the gods as they really are in a pattern that depicts

the order they impose (6.73–74). Arachne responds by giving faces back to human victims of divine violence, and she produces a tapestry of miraculous disorder (6.121–22; note the emphatic *reddidit*). The ecphrasis of Mulciber's designs starts off with an image we can easily visualize of gods that we cannot easily reconcile with an image, and it ends with an image we cannot imagine of the world as it really is. Looking ahead to the narrative to come, we will start similarly from a depiction of the Sun made notoriously problematic by the very act of naming him. Referring to the divinity simply as *Sol* or even by the descriptive *Phoebus* continually raises the problem of how to give a human face to a natural phenomenon. Then, as the narrative continues, we find Ovid virtuosically cataloguing the very features of the earth that are left unnamed in the ecphrasis. And as opposed to the classic ecphrastic model of the *Iliad*, he narrates this image by describing not the artifact as the sculptor creates it, but the reality as Phaethon destroys it. The basic tensions that emerge can be described as follows: a credible human image (the Sun) containing or embodying something that cannot be seen or known by human means versus an unimaginably vast and complex designation of the created cosmos containing the inaccessible human form of Phaethon. We start by looking at the gods as humans see them, with the claim that these are real gods, and we end with the universe as the gods see it. This last divergence of perspectives recalls a continual mirroring within the episode linked to its very truth-making structures. Seeing the Sun god face to face will, as Minerva would have it, prove to Phaethon that stories are true, while the Sun god becomes a source of knowledge, and an authoritative witness for Clymene, because he sees her even as he is seen by Phaethon (1.769–70).

To summarize, the ecphrasis provokes reflection on repetition in two related ways. First it connects the formal phenomenon with the reader's understanding of the relationship between representation and reality in a manner that directs attention to the challenges of interpreting Ovid's text. As an example of such challenges, consider the depiction of the Sun himself, seated on a throne covered in shining emeralds (2.24–25). Do the emeralds represent the fundamental quality of brilliance possessed by the real Sun? Or are we to imagine that the real Sun shines because of the emeralds?¹⁶ My second point involves the relationship between the unchanging ecphrasis and the linear narrative of Ovid's poem. The inevitable conflict between poetry and the visual arts here becomes focused on the issue of repetition. We have seen how the narrativization of ecphrasis, its placement in a sequence, undermines the authority of Mulciber's image as a representation of things as they are.

Conversely, the ecphrasis itself maps the opposed representational perspectives that mark the beginning and end of Ovid's narrative, from human presences taken to express cosmic entities—signs really are what they denote—to the belief that material reality has a face and a representable structure. In turning back from image to narrative, I will use this contest between the verbal and the visual again to ask about the significance of repetition as a distinctive quality of Ovid's epic moving through time. My argument is that repetition, appropriate to the larger trajectory of the Phaethon story, stands revealed as an effort to assimilate the mortal and the divine, and therefore also as a distinctively mortal practice that marks human separation from divinity.

REPETITION AND TEMPORALITY:
BETWEEN DIVINE AND MORTAL

It is not merely a figure of speech to describe Phaethon's arrival in book 2 as his entering the picture.¹⁷ The cosmic image here is, after all, a door, and the observer passes through (*intravit*, 2.20). Ovid works a little representational magic at this point of entry, with the transitional *quo* (2.19). The spatial referent can equally be to the doors of the palace or to the sky itself, which is the final image described, "*caeli fulgentis imago*." Has Phaethon arrived at a representation or at reality—or, rather, at the real sky or the real image? This familiar Ovidian conundrum matters to the Phaethon episode because of the way the visual has already been highlighted in the introductory stages of his story as able to make the opposed medium of mere words count as true. Phaethon's own boasts of divine ancestry ("*magna loquentem*," 1.751), boasts that recall many of the polemics against turgid and inflated epic,¹⁸ depend, as his rival Epaphus points out, on his believing his mother ("*matri*' que ait '*omnia demens / credis et es tumidus genitoris imagine falsi*,'" 1.753–54). And the name of his mother, *Clymene*, connects all too closely with mere oral representation or hearsay (*kleos* ~ *fama*).¹⁹ Phaethon seeks, by contrast a mark, a *notam*, and, significantly, *signa*. When he arrives at the door of the Sun's palace, *signa* are of course what he finds, but the question will be whether these *signa* are themselves true or merely another kind of false image.²⁰

One answer to the dilemma of whether Phaethon has really reached reality or merely its representation would, of course, be that he has reached the sky *and* its representation, because the two are exactly the same. The Sun, who sees and is seen, inhabits a place of semantic wholeness, where signs and reality are one. And it is important to note that this convergence of referents appears also in the kind of wordplay that emerges from the letters (*notae*) on

the page. For instance, Phaethon is seeking his “*patrios ortus*” (1.779), his own paternal origins and the rising of his father, both of which are in the same place (Ahl 1985, 170–71). If both meanings of *ortus* converge, this method of reading further affirms the connection between Phaethon and Phoebus: not only do the two names share the same meaning, but the brightness they signify is a distinctive quality of the real Sun, and the visual, material elements of Ovid’s poem, the *notae* assume the verifying capacities of the sculpted *signa*. However, the very sequencing of letters on the page also introduces a trajectory that takes Phaethon away from his father. *Phoebus* and *Phaethon* start the same but end differently. To push the argument even farther, *Phoebus* is an adjective, whereas *Phaethon* ends like a participle. Brightness seems a defining and inseparable quality of the father, while shining is merely something Phaethon does, for now.

Appropriately, the boundary between ecphrasis and narrative is blurred in another sense that directly connects the confusion of image and reality with two different perspectives on time itself. As Barchiesi (2005, 236–37) points out, even after the ecphrasis would seem formally to have ended, thanks to the refocusing of the narrative on Phaethon, the real scene of the Sun that confronts him seems itself to be a *tableau vivant* looking for all the world like another picture. The Sun sits in the middle of an allegorical depiction of temporal units: days, months, ages, and, ultimately *Horae* (2.26), who, *pace* Barchiesi (2005, 241), may or may not have been clearly translated from Greek seasons into Latin hours. The problem, characteristically, emerges precisely from deciding where they fall in the sequence of temporal units on the doors. Do they mark the end of the distinctively Latin measurements of time that precede them (note especially *saecula*), or do they provide a generalizing term for the individual seasons that follow? Appropriately the first of these seasons, *ver* may punningly invite speculation about whether personified *Ver* is the true spring. Hours themselves are, anyway, a surprisingly unstable unit in Roman time. They seem regular enough as marks on a sundial, but in fact the reality is that they depict changes according to the time of year, so that hours in the summer are longer than those in the winter.²¹ The way that the meaning of *hora* is in fact changed by the seasons so that words no longer indicate a stable reality is thus captured brilliantly by Ovid’s own positioning of the *Horae*.

As the *Horae* turn back time from Latin to their Greek original, they draw further attention to the larger paradox involved in creating a static depiction of time. In reality, all the temporal units who flank the Sun can only appear to

humans sequentially. One can never experience summer and winter simultaneously outside of a representation. It is tempting to see the Sun as a fundamental figure of repetition. He does the same thing every single day, and it is this infinite repeatability that, in addition to his brilliance and his altitude, makes him an ideal figure of immortality. He connotes repetition as the recurrence of a pattern where everything fundamentally resembles the day before. But the problem of representing the Sun, the connection of his circularity with his position in the center of a visual image, makes us look at things a little differently. The Sun as Phaethon sees him figures the ideal synchronicity that human time can never achieve. Ahl (1985, 182–83) notes that in Latin the words for resemblance also connote temporal simultaneity, “*simul ac-ra*,” suggesting in a different way how the problem of representation connects to the idea of temporal progress. Just as there is no distance between the image of the sky and the sky as the goal of Phaethon’s journey, so there is no before or after, no sequentiality, in the representation of time that includes the Sun at its center. What may seem striking throughout the episode, especially in a pre-Copernican universe, is the Sun’s immobility. He is always in his palace, whereas Phaethon approaches him. Then, when he next intervenes in the story by *not* rising (2.329–30), the human audience looks back at that event from the distance of time. In both cases, too, the presence of the Sun marks the moment of truth; as the absent Sun is not believed to be a father by Phaethon, so his absence from the sky will not be believed by us.

How Phaethon’s appearance, as if a figure for its own narrativization, introduces a disruptive sequentiality into the image of the Sun emerges particularly from the lines in which father and son first set eyes on one another, which follow immediately from the tableau of times: “*inde loco medius rerum novitate paventem, / Sol oculis iuvenem quibus aspicit omnia vidit*” (2.30–31). The specific sight of Phaethon contrasts with the universal generality: the Sun sees all things. The son, as a *iuvenis*, is at a certain stage of life, which contrasts with the recurrent temporal units personified in the scene: he is “young” now and will progress through the ages of life, but only once. And Phaethon brings the element of *novitas*, which is out of place among the unchanging figurations of time.²² Yet the idea of *novitas* also allows us to consider together the perspectives of father and son as they gaze through the mirror, so to speak, at one another. If Phaethon’s newness stresses the arrival of a mortal image of temporality, he is the one encountering a terrifying strangeness in the unfamiliar world of the sky. The line pits Phaethon against his father in a struggle for control over reality: *rerum*, whose own position at the mirroring center

of the line between the Sun and the boy makes it uncertain where it belongs grammatically. Is the Sun sitting “*medius rerum*,” in the midst of images that really are things, or is it the newness of things, the strange face things wear when seen *sub specie aeternitatis*, that frightens Phaethon? Again the contrasting perspectives oppose an interpretation of images based on a familiarity with real things (Phaethon’s point of view) with one that sees the images themselves as reality. And the significance of its formal structure in articulating this opposition gives an iconic aspect to the line itself, so that it seems to stand on the threshold between being a static arrangement of signs on the page, like the figures around the Sun, or representing a new phase in the narrative.

This reading of the mutual gaze exchanged by Phaethon and Sol suggests that the infinite repeatability of solar action collapses into an impression of timeless synchrony when contrasted with the particular narrative incident of Phaethon’s arrival. The very act of repetition as practiced by Phaethon, which is only perceptible when time is measured in a linear fashion, brings with it the possibility of semantic confusion by contrast to the sameness of sign and referent in a world where neither can be before or after the other. Another pattern of imagery within the episode also conveys this opposition: circularity evokes the bounded orbits of the cosmos, the static tableau that places the Sun at the center of a series of images, and the eternal recurrence that marks its celestial course, as opposed to the straightness of Phaethon’s path. The *regia solis* at first seems simply regal (2.1), but the image of command unfolds into one of directionality when the cognate verb *regere* is also used of Phaethon’s efforts to “make straight” the horses that pull the Sun’s chariot (2.86). By contrast, the dangers offered by the monstrous figures of the heavens are all emphatically connected with curves: first the Scorpion “curving its arms in a circle” (“*circuitu curvantem bracchia*,” 2.82), then in the very next line the Crab, “curving its arms back the other way” (“*aliter curvantem bracchia Cancrum*”).²³ These images of circularity are themselves repeated here, but their further repetition, when Phaethon encounters the Scorpion in the course of his journey, coincides with his abandonment of control over his path, as he drops the reins (2.195–200).²⁴ But this fatal recurrence becomes apparent only when we move from a consideration of “signs” in terms of abstract shapes on a schematic map of the cosmos to direct contact with them in the course of a narrated series of events, when circularity becomes repetition, and the circle is viewed not as a whole from outside but as a path to move along in time.

Phaethon’s instant of self-recognition, that Delphic moment at which he learns that he is a mortal, is doubly constrained by temporality. It is a single

instant, as the triply repeated *iam* makes clear (2.182–84). *Now* he would prefer not to have touched the horses of the Sun; *now* it grieves him to know his origins; but *now* it is too late. At this moment, Phaethon sees his path in powerfully linearized terms: he looks back to the Sun's rising (*ortus*) and ahead to its setting (*occasus*, 2.190). The circle of the sky is reduced to what is behind him and what is ahead of him. But at the same time, a schism opens up in the meanings of these words that reveals the tragic distinctiveness of Phaethon's perspective on these immortal signs. During Phaethon's first journey, as he moved cheerfully onward and upward, his *ortus* were his destination; the journey, as he thought, was taking him cyclically back to his beginnings. And the trajectory of his own life (with *ortus* meaning origin) mapped exactly onto the cosmos (with *ortus* meaning the rising of the Sun). Here the equivalent term, *occasus*, starts out with a cosmic signification, the setting of the Sun, which Fate will not allow him to reach. Yet the very mention of Fate reminds us that *occasus*, a fall into death, is indeed where Phaethon is heading.

If the day of Phaethon's journey, so nearly the end of everything, marks out a unique lack of repetition in an eternal series of temporal cycles, his father's mourning gesture does the same (2.329–31):

Nam pater obductos luctu miserabilis aegro
 condiderat vultus et, si modo credimus, unum
 isse diem sine sole ferunt.

For the pitiable father had hidden his countenance, covered by dire mourning,
 and, if we but believe, they say that one day passed without the Sun.

In the first instance, a mortal came very close to divinity; here, in response, a god has a brush with mortality.²⁵ Yet as we view that transformative day from within the long extension of human temporality, its significance and even its very reality begin to fade. The present tenses here are emphatic: they say ("ferunt"), if we believe ("si modo credimus"). The single day can only be glimpsed from the long distance of the present, and the only bridge to that past reality is a mere report that "we" are free to disbelieve. The contemporary audience ends up in the same place Phaethon started, disbelieving a report. But other aspects of the story seem to inspire disbelief as well. For that mourning Sun was also the highly anthropomorphized one: he was a *pater*, and had a face to hide. The Sun's hiding of his face can thus be classed with those other marks of separation between man and gods that end the golden

age, like the disappearing gods of Catullus 64 or Justice fleeing men's sight. In that post-fall world, it is up to us to decide whether the Sun became real when he lost his face to become the Sun we know or simply ceased to appear real to us, whose fallen condition makes us doubt the story. The Sun has ceased to be always the same, a referent that allows us to compare present and past. But, by contrast, the mortal world takes on the qualities of permanence as we judge what is believable in the past according to the criteria of the present. Indeed, the problem may reside in the very language by which the event is reported. How can we designate something as a day when there is no Sun? Again it is the human scale of time and the seeming permanence of the words that measure it that threaten to make even the absence of the Sun disappear.

REPETITION AND RECEPTION: A TALE OF "WHOA!"

If disbelief in a report about the Sun has put us back on earth, looking up at an inaccessible sky we are able to approach only through rumor, then it is especially appropriate that Clymene should emerge again to signal the completion of the circle. This figure of oral communication comes back in again, "saying," as her near translation, *Fama*, will ten books later, "all the things that were to be said" (2.333–34). Her journey to the west mirrors Phaethon's own, except that she travels on earth rather than in the sky, and the signs she seeks prove her son's mortality rather than his immortality. Having spoken of the Sun as a human father, animating nature with human presences, she is now brought down to earth by recognizing the absence of Phaethon in the entire world. And this shift further links the changeability of linguistic signs with the move toward mortality: where Phaethon went toward his *ortus*, she seeks mere *artus*, "limbs" (2.336), and her quest involves a further declension over the course of time, as she progresses from seeking limbs to mere bones, which she discovers coupled with a sign for the empty sign itself, a *nomen* inscribed on a stone. Her quest retraces the whole process of human creation back to its own set of material origins. Pyrrha created men by recognizing that bones can mean stones (1.393–94). But in the face of her son's death, the stone is just a stone, and the *nomen* is nothing more than the inscribed word.

This reversal of Pyrrha's act of miraculous generation occurs among echoes of other creative processes familiar from book 1. Like the earth retaining the seeds of the sky to provide the material to create potentially disruptive humans (1.80–81), or like the earth later preserving the essence of her own Giant children, also struck down by Jupiter's fire (1.157), or again like Pyrrha, another fiery creator, who makes the leap of becoming like the earth by creating men

in her own image, a metaphorical mother instead of a real mother, Clymene will unconsciously transform writing into another sequence of *fabulae* stretching from the distant mythical past right down to the present. She waters the name, and warms/cherishes it in her bosom as though it were her own son (2.338–39). But her literal minded re-enactment of what Pyrrha had done, minus the metaphor by which stones become bones, suddenly blossoms forth in a burst of metonymic radiance. An unbelievable transformation ensues, as the sisters of Phaethon are transformed into poplars. And while none of them will ever be Phaethon, whose total absence and deadness stand out markedly in a poem about metamorphoses, they all signify him unstoppably. They are, of course, known as the *Heliades*, making the male, singular, and Latin *Sol*—the referent of Phaethon’s name—Greek, feminine, and plural. And the metamorphosis of the *nomen* Phaethon itself continues on the page, just as metamorphoses proliferate in the narrative. First comes Phaethusa, and then Lampetie, and finally the girls turn to trees and then to amber. Both a physical trace and a corresponding linguistic trace emerge from Phaethon to survive into the Augustan present.²⁶ Amber, created through the Sun/father’s hardening liquid as opposed to the mother’s moistening stone, provides the material precipitate of this chain of metamorphoses, while the stream that sends it down to be worn by Roman brides is *lucidus*, another Latin translation of the root in Phaethon’s name (2.365).

But are these really metonyms? That is, do these material and linguistic traces suggest a mere renaming of Phaethon and so pull everything back to the essential figure of Phaethon, or are they simply increasingly imperfect replacements that owe their origins fundamentally to his absence? The conundrum is embedded in the inscription that becomes the center of these transformations. It begins “hic situs est Phaethon” (2.327). But where is “here”? In a far-off place and far-off time? If Phaethon is “there,” he cannot be here with the reader in the present—unless Ovid’s poetic text, which has become identical with the inscription, becomes that *sema*. The question of Phaethon’s mutability had earlier been hinted at when the Sun asked him to renounce his request, “si mutabile pectus est tibi” (2.145). If he had been changeable, he would not have been the god’s son, but neither would his story have ended in death. This immutability thus functions as a marker at once of his immortality and of his utter disappearance. He always wanted to be as nearly as possible identical to what his name signified: the Sun. Even his words stay the same, though they transform his father’s. To tell the story of Phaethon, in whatever form—epic, tragedy, or indeed epigram—is inevitably to deny that Phaethon is Phoebus

and so to refute his own claim about his identity, putting him back into time, or perhaps taking him out of it. Yet if we allow for substitution, for language to take the place of things and produce them, for images to count as real, then Phaethon is what the inscription says he is: “here,” *hic*. Like the ecphrasis that stands at the other end of the episode, the epigram itself manages to be simultaneously an object preserved in Ovid’s text and a miniaturized reflection of the narrative within which it occurs. So it curiously preserves both the static and the temporal qualities that make Phaethon what he seems to be and tells the story that shows he was not. Hence, in the first line, he is his father’s son, and he is the driver of the chariot.²⁷ But the second line adds some verbs to the nouns, and the narrative they denote describes at once his failure and the compensation for his failure: he did not hold the chariot, but he fell from a great height.²⁸

There is one final “return” in the episode that reproduces the antithetical polysemy of the tomb and provides a concluding demonstration of how repetition takes us both toward the divine and away from it. As Clymene watches her daughters turn into trees, she herself experiences a kind of sympathetic destruction. Rather like Hippolytus at the end of another wild chariot ride, she is “dragged here and there” by *impetus*, here signifying her longing for her daughters (2.356; cf. 2.73, where the Sun, uniquely, prevails over the *impetus* of the turning sky). She wants to kiss each of them, and when kissing proves insufficient, she tries “to rip their bodies from their trunks” (2.357). Not only does this gesture, by juxtaposing two synonymous terms—*corpus* and *truncus*—take us back to the problem of *ortus*, where words no longer have a unitary meaning, but Clymene seems for all the world like those Lucretian lovers whose erotic desire has blinded them to the material reality of the world as each tries to absorb the lover’s body into his or her own. The Lucretian atmosphere²⁹ prompts another reflection: as her daughters more or less observe, Clymene’s actions are simultaneously creative and destructive. When we plot this Lucretian revelation within the trajectory of Ovidian narrative repetition, many familiar issues emerge in new forms. On the one hand we have literally returned to the unspoken narrative beginning of the story, as Clymene’s sexual act leads to the birth of Phaethon. Phaethon too, from this perspective, was destroyed by desire—“flagrat cupidine” (2.104). Within the semantic story we have been tracing, however, we might initially place the emphasis on difference. First *ortus* means *ortus*; then, as *ortus* and *occasus* pull apart, Phaethon discovers that words have two meanings and that as a mortal his *occasus* will be different from his divine father’s.³⁰ Now we discover that the

opposite processes of creation and destruction are one. At the same time, we have moved from a story fundamentally about the gods to one about the natural world. Phaethon's rise and fall retrace the reception of poetic representations of the gods, from a literal belief in myth ("the Sun is an anthropomorphic divinity capable of fathering children") to Lucretian-inflected allegory, where seemingly miraculous narratives about girls changing into trees expose a fundamental truth about the natural world: that all creation is destruction. The Sun is heat, the tears are moisture, and from these opposites matter is transformed, neither created nor destroyed. We have also seen a lesson in the physics of desire, which proves another constant presence in the episode. And the same Clymene who all too readily believes in the reality of the fictive Sun disbelieves the natural miracle of her daughters' metamorphosis. To return to the semantic problem raised by Mulciber's panel, the different alternatives of reading representation have also settled into one and moved apart. To see the image as creating the world equals allowing represented miraculous divinities to change our view of reality. To see reality as determining representation explains the miracle as a reflection of the nature of things. The competition between the one and the other perspective in reading every Ovidian story, as here the allegorical revelation can seem only another miraculous new beginning, suggests how, through the incongruities of repetition, Ovid's poem itself rehearses the conditions that separate human art from the divine.

I have tried to show in this chapter how—at the most obviously marked structural moment of repetition in the work, its second beginning—Ovid highlights repetition itself as an essential figure for interpreting his poem. The ecphrasis, the epigram, and the narrative between them all repeat one another by focusing in on the paradoxical role of repetition in a poem about change. The repeated question is whether, as we compare before to after, our emphasis should fall on words becoming things or things becoming words. The naming magic that recalls Phaethon in everything from his sister's names to the amber, or *electrum*, that as Ahl (1985, 187–88) brilliantly suggests, rewrites the "rereading," *relectum*, of the tomb itself or perhaps recalls the other, singular, Electra, who similarly preserves the memory of her father in the face of her mother's violence, seems to have a fundamental basis in reality. The named presence of Phaethon figures the role of his father, now the physical Sun, in hardening the amber, and the entire elemental description of its creation makes the most miraculous part of the story simultaneously the most scientific. In the beginning we asked whether a static artistic image really was the cosmos. Now we note that the linear flow of the poem, moving like a river,

brings down fragments of the truth. The unchanging Sun, the real Sun, stands both as the unmoved referent of the initial tableau in Ovid's poem and the ultimate source of the *lucidus amnis*. On the other hand, as every sign is dislodged from its meaning by the passage of time, making the Sun paradoxically not shine, Phaethon invisible, and the act of destruction simultaneously creative, the suspicion arises that repetition makes any act of connection with and representation of the past entirely arbitrary, with readers struggling to build resemblance into meaning and wresting unity from opposition and boundless multiplicity.

NOTES

1. For the positioning of the Phaethon episode both to highlight and to override (so to speak) book divisions, see Holzberg 1998, 88–92.

2. For a connection to the legend of Augustus's divine birth, see Doblhofer 1973; for the myth as a reflection on succession, see Fratantuono 2011, 32–35. On the connection with Gaius, see Videau 2010, 527–35. Equally important are efforts to connect representation to imperial reality through resemblances between the fictive monuments described in the poem and such features of the Roman cityscape as the house of Augustus and attached temple of Apollo (Bartholomé 1935, 17–18; further bibliography, Barchiesi 2005, 237, and, especially Dufallo 2013, 160–65), or the circus with its cosmic imagery (Barchiesi 2009). The fullest attempt to contextualize the narrative in terms of contemporary imperial politics and iconography is to be found in Schmitzer 1990, 89–107. See Rebenich 2009 for an overview of such interpretations and an argument for the fundamental ambivalence of the figure of Phaethon, who plays an important part in shaping the public image of such later emperors as Caligula (cf. degl'Innocenti Pierini 1985) and Nero. For Phaethon as one of a number of child characters who represent Ovid's appropriation of the paternal language of epic, see Morgan 2003.

3. Contra Galinsky (1975, 49), who argues that formal metamorphosis plays no significant role in the Phaethon story and that Ovid instead uses the episode to expand the theme of metamorphosis to include psychological development and issues of identity.

4. He is the referent of the story Clymene tells her son, and he repeats it to Epaphus in turn. In terms of the episode's geography, he is the goal of Phaethon's first journey and the starting point of the second. His appearance leads from the ecphrastic description of the cosmos at the beginning of book 2 to the narrative of Phaethon's experience of it later. See also the schema of Bass 1977, 406.

5. So also R. Brown 1987, 214: "It is with signal irony that he whom his palace proclaims to be the guarantor of cosmic order becomes through his rash promise to Phaethon the cause of its disarray."

6. The connection between the hermeneutic confusion inherent in artistic representation and Phaethon's efforts to imitate his father has also been developed by Dufallo 2013, 160–65. Distinctive to Dufallo's approach is the causal link between the two phenomena: he treats the images themselves as didactic, so that Phaethon's failure to imitate his father involves the neglect of instructions conveyed both verbally and by an artistic representation that, in any case, bears an uncertain relationship to reality.

7. Cf. the complex argument of Wise 1977, 44–53, which presents Phaethon's failure as a breakdown of the imagination, making him unable to match static images with their changeable reality.

8. Ahl (1985, 184) discusses the parallel as one of several examples of a chariot journey representing "each human crossing the boundaries of his mortality." Schiesaro (2014, 74) argues that "Phaethon's ascent to the sky in search of the truth follows in the footsteps of a distinguished series of thinkers and philosophers who, metaphorically or otherwise, had embarked on the quest for extra-terrestrial knowledge." His own analysis, however, focuses specifically on Epicurus, on the strength of Lucretian echoes in Ovid's language later in the episode, especially (*Met.* 2.767 ~ *DRN* 3.15). Whereas Schiesaro's comparison to Epicurus and the tradition of philosophical inquiry highlights the transgressive aspect of Phaethon's character, reading the episode against Plato's allegory makes him rather an everyman, whose partly divine nature and sense that his real home is in the sky reflect the general human condition. The tension between these alternative philosophical paradigms for Phaethon's journey is not without consequence for one's general response to Phaethon's experiences.

9. All citations derive from Tarrant 2004. Translations are my own.

10. Indeed, as Wheeler (1995, 98) notes, the ecphrasis takes us back to the literary origins of Ovid's seemingly authentic creation by citing the passage of Homer's shield description on which the Ovidian cosmos is based, but now explicitly in the context of another ecphrasis (*Met.* 2.5–7 ~ 1.5 ~ *Il.* 18.483–84: see also Bartholomé 1935, 76). The stoichiometric allusion—the fact that the same image occurs at nearly the same position in the two consecutive books—may itself encourage the reader to see Ovid's text itself as a visible artifact.

11. Schiesaro (2014, 77) suggests that the line encapsulates Ovid's rivalry, both poetic and philosophical, with Lucretius: divine artistry triumphs over mere matter as Ovid's poem does over its Lucretian raw material.

12. For treatment of the sea gods as aesthetically disruptive both on account of their own disorderly, mixed nature and because attention they receive introduces an imbalance into the ecphrasis as a whole, see especially Bartholomé 1935, 75–76, and R. Brown 1987, 215–19.

13. Dufallo 2013, 163.

14. For another interpretation of these figures as depicting Ovid's fundamentally metamorphic conception of reality, see Wise (1977, 46–47), who sees the multiplicity

of the figures represented as a way of capturing reality in art. My argument rather allows for the recognition of how at this point representation and reality potentially part company.

15. R. Brown 1987, 219–20.

16. And the much discussed question of the identity between Sol and Phoebus Apollo may simply extend the text's interrogation of the connection between the actual Sun and its personification in art. See Fontenrose 1940 and, for refutations of his claim that the Sun must be different from Apollo, see especially Wheeler 2000, 67n72; Barchiesi 2005, 238.

17. Cf. Wheeler 2000, 37.

18. For an interpretation of the lines as pointing specifically to Lucretius, see Schiesaro 2014, 87.

19. Barchiesi 2005, 232. For a converse reading of the name as a visual sign conveying light, *lumen*, see Ahl 1985, 171–72.

20. Contrast Wise 1977, 45. She also notes the importance of matching words and things in Phaethon's journey, but sees the failure to do so as a sign of the limits of Phaethon's understanding.

21. See Gildenhard and Zissos 1999, 33.

22. See Schiesaro 2014, 77–78, on the Lucretian resonance of the phrase *novitas rerum*.

23. This image is also “mirrored” in the horns of the Bull and the curving of the Bow (2.80–81).

24. For the Augustan resonance of this detail, see Barchiesi (2005, 245), who observes that at *Georgics* 1.34–35 Scorpio draws back his claws to make space for Augustus in the heavens.

25. Cf. Wheeler 2000, 68–69, on the effects of the assimilation of the Sun to a mortal at this point in the narrative.

26. On this whole sequence, see Ahl 1985, 187–89.

27. He also accomplishes the expected metamorphosis denied him in the narrative by becoming the Charioteer, the constellation into which he was transformed according to the version of the myth alluded to in *Am.* 3.12.37, and thus attains a kind of celestial immortality (see Galinsky 1975, 49).

28. Schiesaro (2014, 86) discusses the line's anticipation of the pardon Longinus (3.3) will grant to those who seek sublimity but fail to achieve it, noted by Barchiesi (2005, 263). Schiesaro reads the epitaph specifically as an attempt to appropriate the sublimity of his predecessor Lucretius from the wreckage of his (from Ovid's perspective) poetic failure.

29. This portrait of how a Lucretian echo in Ovid combines a “zeal to empty the world of presences” with a lesson on the futility of desire takes its inspiration from Hardie 2002, 150–65 (quotation on 150). Lucretian echoes are interestingly distributed earlier in the Phaethon episode. Phaethon's literal-minded attempt to wander

through the immensities of the heavens makes him a kind of backward Epicurus, aiming not to prove the absence of divinities from natural phenomena but to join them. (And unlike Lucretius's hero, Phaethon will be anything but fearless in the face of natural phenomena.) The Sun by contrast paints a very un-Epicurean vision of the life of the gods, one shaped by unending toil as opposed to *ataraxia* (cf. 2.76–77, where he debunks the idea that the gods enjoy a vulgar-Epicurean lifestyle of wealth and abundance). This use of the Phaethon story seems pointedly to reverse Lucretius's own appropriation of the myth to describe the destruction of the world through fire while denying its mythical elements (*DRN* 5.396–405). All of these themes are now discussed in detail in Schiesaro's (2014) comprehensive treatment of Lucretian elements in the episode. For Milton's anti-Lucretian appropriation of Phaethon, and his debt to Ovid, see Quint 2004.

30. So although the oath of the Sun remains fixed, the god tries to persuade his son to interpret it differently—to see that the brilliant sign of the chariot is not an *honor* but, when called by its true name, a *poena* (2.98–99; see Schiesaro 2014, 76–77, for the suggestion that this line evokes *DRN* 5.118 and so contributes to a likening of Phaethon's actions to the Giant-like quest of Epicurus). Conversely, he directs Phaethon's attention to another sign, his own face, as the real proof of the truth of the story he tells. This is again to look to the same thing—the bright disc of the Sun—but now to see it from within the anthropomorphized conventions of Ovid's narrative as a human countenance, at which point it becomes, like the figures in Arachne's tapestry, unchangeable and true. This sad face of the Sun as father will similarly become the sign that Ovid's own audience, like so many disobedient Phaethons, may be inclined to mistrust when it is reported that the Sun's mourning meant that a day passed without its shining (*Met.* 2.92 ~ 2.331).

Repeat after Me

The Loves of Venus and Mars in
Ars amatoria 2 and *Metamorphoses* 4

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD

Repetition in all of its senses is a striking and distinctive feature of Ovid's poetry: from seemingly formulaic repetition of individual words and phrases, to the repetition of familiar *exempla* or similes, to the repetition of entire narratives (sometimes with nearly verbatim citation of an earlier version in a later one), the tightly woven fabric of the Ovidian corpus constitutes an abundant store of internal echoes. Not surprisingly, therefore, recent scholarly studies of Ovid have privileged repetition as a meaningful locus of interpretive possibilities: familiar examples include Stephen Hinds's (1987) study of the two extended versions of the Ceres and Proserpina myth that appear in *Fasti* 4 and *Metamorphoses* 5; Alison Sharrock's (1994b) approach to the repetitious advice of *Ars amatoria* 2 from the perspective of reader response; and Jeffrey Wills's (1996) valuable collection and analysis of types of small-scale repetitions across the entire corpus of Latin verse, in the *index locorum* of which Ovid easily prevails as the most frequently cited author (a fact only partially to be explained by the sizable volume of his collected works).

While many other useful studies of repetitions in Ovid have graced the current *aetas Ovidiana*, I cite these three as exemplary because, taken together, they illustrate that repetition itself can take many forms and lend itself to a variety of interpretive models. Hinds's work—which also explores the equally striking phenomenon of avoidance of repetition where one might expect it¹—brings to the forefront considerations of generic difference, inspired by Richard Heinze's (1919) discussion of the “crossing of genres.” Sharrock draws attention to the psychological and cognitive pleasure aroused in the reader by the combination of didactic repetition with subtle differences of context and perspective; and Wills demonstrates how the echo of phrases, half-lines, and

other word-patterning devices can establish subtle but firm networks of allusion between and among different poems and poets. Questions of genre, the reader's expectations, and the interpretability of inter- and intratextual allusions all offer points of entry to the character and substance of Ovidian repetition; the interplay of all three will be exploited in the following discussion.

My focus here is on Ovid's repeated use of a single and unique Homeric narrative: the betrayal of Hephaestus by his wife, Aphrodite, and her lover, Ares, as told by Demodocus at the Phaeacian court in *Odyssey* 8. The Homeric story was something of a cause célèbre in ancient criticism, its notoriety going back at least to the Alexandrian scholars who questioned the Homeric authenticity of the episode on the basis of its language and its scandalous portrayal of illicit divine sex.² I shall show here that Ovid, aware of the controversy, draws pointed attention to it in each of his retellings of the story and uses the very phenomenon of repetition to establish the story's Homeric credentials.³ Recognizing that the story is an outlier in the Homeric poems because of its introduction of sexual burlesque into the world of heroic epic, and that repetition—of words, phrases, themes, and type scenes—is a central feature of Homeric compositional technique, Ovid singles out a story that so perfectly anticipates his own boundary-testing inclinations (surely it is no coincidence that this is a story featuring the amorous exploits of Rome's divine ancestors) precisely in order to assert its Homeric provenance. Simultaneously, he exploits its didactic resonance both to demonstrate its "educational" value in Homer and to reinterpret its lessons for new audiences.

Before I turn to these narratives, a final preliminary consideration is in order: the treatment that the two Ovidian versions of the story have received in modern scholarship. Given Ovid's predilection for self-repetition, it is perhaps not surprising that his two versions of the Venus and Mars tale have received relatively little attention as a pair, aside from being seen as a further instantiation of the generic play thoroughly analyzed by Hinds with respect to a different pair of narratives, Ovid's two versions of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.⁴ Each of the two has been the object of individual analysis in the contexts in which they appear: the version of the tale given in *Ars amatoria* 2 has, not surprisingly, been read as in some way a comment on or response to the Augustan marriage legislation,⁵ and the version in *Metamorphoses* 4 has received some (generally passing) comment from critics interested in the inset narratives of the Minyeides.⁶ My goal in this chapter, therefore, is to offer a detailed comparison and analysis of the two narratives in light of their Homeric model, and so to arrive at a new understanding of Ovidian repetitive

practice as a form of reception. As I have suggested elsewhere (Boyd 2012), Ovid figures himself as a (wayward) heir to Homeric tradition from the outset of the *Metamorphoses*. In this chapter I suggest that in repeating a distinctive Homeric tale not once but twice, Ovid appropriates Homer's poetic distinctiveness throughout his own poetry, recognizing in the flexibility of formulaic verse a nuanced means for innovation within a traditional medium. In other words, he takes a cue from Homer himself in innovating upon a tale that is at once traditional and exceptional.

THE FIRST TIME: A HOMERIC SONG WORTH REPEATING

Let us begin with Homer. *Odyssey* 8 finds Odysseus in the Phaeacian court, an as-yet-unidentified guest of Alcinous and Arete. Alcinous initiates preparations for a ship to provide the newcomer with safe passage and then announces a period of feasting and entertainment in the interim. The blind singer Demodocus is summoned and proceeds to sing about an episode from the Trojan War—strife between Achilles and Odysseus, and its interpretation by Agamemnon as fulfillment of a prophecy about the impending end of the war (*Od.* 8.72–82).⁷ Hearing about himself and his old comrades-in-arms, Odysseus hides his head and weeps; Alcinous, noticing the stranger's emotional reaction, halts the performance and proposes a series of outdoor games (8.83–103). Taunted by the king's son Laodamas and his friend Euryalus for his apparent age and weariness, Odysseus responds with both strong words and an impressive hurling of the discus. To restore the festive air, Alcinous reconvenes the feast and summons Demodocus again (8.131–255). This time the singer offers a very different song, not about Troy but about the love affair of Ares and Aphrodite (8.266–366). After Odysseus's positive response to this song (8.367–68), he is showered with gifts from Alcinous and the other lords of Phaeacia and is offered a bath and fresh clothes by Arete (8.386–457). In yet another round of feasting, the newly refreshed stranger asks Demodocus to tell another Trojan War story—this time, about the Trojan horse. Again Odysseus is moved to tears as he recalls his younger self and the comrades he has since lost (8.470–531). Now, rather than shielding his guest further, Alcinous invites the stranger to identify himself and explain the reason for his tears (8.431–586).

I offer this summary of the entire book so that the context in which the Ares and Aphrodite story is told will be readily available. It is worth noting in the first place that the song of Ares and Aphrodite is the central of three songs

performed by Demodocus; while the first and third stories are familiar to Odysseus, and so the source of sorrow, the tale of Ares and Aphrodite is both novel and distinctively non-epic in its themes. At the same time, it can be seen to offer a variation on the theme of marital fidelity (and the tensions surrounding it) that is generally recognized to be at the core of the poem's plot, and that will echo, in unexpected ways, in Ovid's revisions. Finally, before we proceed to examine Ovid's two versions of the tale, a more detailed review of some aspects of the story suggests that the Homeric narrative itself invites both repetition and reinterpretation. This in turn prepares the way for a demonstration of how Ovid's two versions continue this process.

The Homeric story establishes its themes early. After the two gods and their love affair are named (*Od.* 8.267), the poet quickly and with little elaboration describes their first rendezvous at the house of Hephaestus, in secrecy but with the provision of many gifts (8.268–70). Straightaway Helios, having witnessed their union, reports it to Hephaestus, who immediately heads to his forge to craft a snare for the lovers (8.270–75). The poet then slows the pace of the narrative somewhat, to detail the anger of the divine smith and his suspension of a fine net around and above the bed—a net so finely crafted that it recalls nothing so much as the work of a spider (8.276–81). While Hephaestus pretends to leave for Lemnos, Ares hastens back and urges Aphrodite to have sex with him again; again they go to bed together, only to find themselves trapped and, indeed, immobilized by Hephaestus's ruse (8.282–99).

Hephaestus comes back to catch them in flagrante delicto; at this visual confirmation of what Helios had reported, he bitterly apostrophizes Zeus and the other gods, lamenting his lameness and inferior looks and laying the fault at his parents' feet for having engendered him. Hephaestus then declares his intention to keep the two lovers ensnared until he is repaid the bride-price he gave Zeus upon his marriage to Aphrodite (8.300–320). Meanwhile, the other male gods gather at the threshold of Hephaestus's house, and burst into laughter at the result of the divine smith's craft; the witticisms that they share about the sorry plight of Ares and Aphrodite culminate in Hermes's declaration of his willingness to suffer three times as much at Hephaestus's hands in order to share Aphrodite's bed (8.321–43). Only Poseidon refrains from the bawdy exchange; instead, he promises, in return for the release of the two gods, to pay Ares's debt if Ares himself is somehow able to elude Hephaestus's demands. Once freed, the two lovers swiftly separate, each going to a familiar abode—Ares to Thrace and Aphrodite to Paphos, where she is bathed and honored by the Graces (8.344–66).

While Ovid, we shall see, revisits in interesting ways several features of this story, the critical reception has tended to have a somewhat narrower focus, shaped in the first place by Homer's ancient readers. The apparent frivolousness of the story has itself been cause for concern, a concern exacerbated by the unseemly nature of divine laughter in the face of divine immorality; and the references to bride-price (ἔεδνα, 8.318) and payment of restitution (μοιχάγρια, 8.332) have contributed to scholarly curiosity about laws surrounding ancient marriage and the punishment of adultery.⁸ While the last several decades of Homeric scholarship have dispelled earlier concerns about the episode's Homeric authenticity and have provided both cultural and intertextual frameworks in which to locate the tale's playful exposé, the primary focus has been on the resonance of the story within the larger context of the *Odyssey*; the juxtaposition of an episode of divine infidelity that concludes with humor and no serious consequences for any of the parties involved is generally appreciated as a reverse image of events on the human level, where Penelope's ability to continue to fend off the suitors is increasingly threatened and Odysseus's vengeance for the suitors' disrespect will culminate in slaughter. Other features of Demodocus's tale, meanwhile, are treated piecemeal in recent commentaries but do not generally feature prominently in Homeric studies.⁹

A consideration of the Homeric story from an Ovidian vantage point, however, suggests that there is more to be said both about Homer's tale itself and about its reception by Ovid.¹⁰ As we turn to Ovid, I want to draw attention to several details in particular in the Homeric version of the story: the brevity of narration of the initial seduction and of Helios's role as informant compared with the detail devoted to the net crafted by Hephaestus, including a vivid simile; the active character of Ares's pursuit juxtaposed to Aphrodite's passive compliance; the vengeful frustration of Hephaestus's response to his wife's infidelity, made prominent by the use of reported direct speech;¹¹ the varied reactions of the gods to the display of Ares and Aphrodite in flagrante, ranging as it does from naughty humor to moralizing to implied disapproval; and the hurried parting of Ares and Aphrodite, followed by a bath that helps to restore the goddess's allure. As I demonstrate in the following discussion, a calculated mixture of suppression, compression, and/or expansion of each of these aspects of the Homeric tale is used by Ovid to make each of his versions appropriate to its context and thematically coherent; at the same time, Ovid's manipulation of the story can be seen to function as a form of comment upon narrative repetition itself, as he draws attention to the slippage

between Homer's story and his own versions of it. One of these details, in fact, provides an apt starting point for this investigation, as it illustrates that, in choosing to make this Homeric tale a locus of play with the idea of narrative repetition, Ovid takes a cue from the Homeric poem itself. Although the way in which Demodocus draws the story to a close—with a concluding scene of Aphrodite in the bath, surrounded by attendant Graces—serves to restore a sense of decorum both to the story and to the gods featured in it, the bathing scene also opens up the potential for an entirely new, yet repetitious, episode of desire and seduction. Freshly bathed and anointed, and clad in beautiful garments, Aphrodite brings the story to a close with a hint of anticipation for her next rendezvous with Ares. In fact, a nearly identical description of Aphrodite's journey to Paphos, where she is bathed and anointed by the Graces and clad in beautiful garments, appears in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (58–63), in a passage detailing her preparations for the seduction of Anchises.¹² Ovid does not include the Homeric bath in either of the versions of the story that appear in his verse, but he nonetheless seizes on the suggestion of an erotic afterlife that the bathing scene holds as he revises this story of a divine assignation so that it occurs not once but repeatedly, incessantly, and repetitiously in his poetry.¹³

ARS AMATORIA 2:

A HOMERIC LESSON IN ADULTERY

In the second book of the *Ars amatoria*, the Ovidian *praeceptor* is at pains to offer his (male) readers advice on how to remain in the good graces of a beloved. A central theme is not to care too much about a lover's unfaithfulness, and to avoid mentioning it even if brought to one's attention: once the story is out, all concern for shame is lost, and the resulting open secret can hurt only the one who has been betrayed.

To enhance the persuasiveness of this rather counterintuitive advice, Ovid introduces the secret love affair of Venus and Mars, and the consequences for Vulcan of its outing (*Ars am.* 2.561–600). Ovid opens the episode with a couplet that both identifies it as a story with a distinguished pedigree and introduces its three protagonists: “fabula narratur toto notissima caelo / Mulciberis capti Marsque Venusque dolis” (“a most famous tale is told in all of heaven, / how Mars and Venus were trapped by the tricks of Vulcan, god of fire”). The literary provenance of the story is not explicitly identified as Homer; rather, Ovid simultaneously gestures to his literary model and implies the broad familiarity—indeed, the notoriety—of the *exemplum* with the adjective

notissima. The rapid succession of three names in the pentameter likewise insists on immediate recognition, and the framing of the line with the words “Mulciberis . . . dolis” offers a visual cue to the story of entrapment that is told by Homer.

With the next couplet, however, the narrative begins to diverge from its Homeric model, as Mars is transformed into an elegiac lover (“de duce terribili factus amator,” “from a dread warrior a lover was made,” 2.564); and the story itself is now framed not as a tale of shared desire (ἄμφ’ Ἄρεος φιλότητος εὐστεφάνου τ’ Ἀφροδίτης, “concerning Ares and beautiful-crowned Aphrodite,” *Od.* 8.267) but one of tormented passion on the part of Mars (“insano Veneris turbatus amore,” “distracted by his mad love for Venus,” *Ars am.* 2.563).¹⁴ Fortunately for Mars, Venus is not a harsh mistress, but knowing and indulgent (“nec . . . rustica . . . difficilisque,” 2.565–66).¹⁵

The elegiac cast of the narrative is underscored in the next couplet (2.567–68), which opens with the exclamatory “a, quotiens”: this line opening features repeatedly in emotionally overwrought elegiac lament (e.g., *Am.* 2.19.11–14),¹⁶ and often is spoken by a lover in distress—but here the distress appears to be expressed by the *praeceptor*, as he recalls for his reader the shameless fun made of the lame smith god by his faithless wife. Shaming laughter is a central motif of the Homeric tale, when the male gods gather on Hephaestus’s threshold to laugh at the ensnared lovers; here, however, the joke is private, enjoyed by the lovers alone, and the absent and ignorant Vulcan is its butt. The next couplet (2.569–70) develops the difference: Venus is said not only to have laughed at Vulcan, but even to have imitated his limp in the presence of Mars—and, the *praeceptor* continues, this mimicry itself was charming: “multaque cum forma gratia mixta fuit” (“much charm was mixed with her beauty”). Her limp, humorous in itself, is also a marker of the scene’s elegiac affiliation: her “defective” gait recalls a pun that Ovid uses elsewhere as a virtual signature for his elegy, beginning with Cupid’s theft of a metrical “foot” in the very first poem of his early work, the *Amores* (*Am.* 1.1.1–4), and deployed later in the same collection as a defining—and charming—feature of personified Elegy: “venit . . . Elegia . . . / et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat. . . / et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat” (“Elegy came, and one foot, I believe, was longer than the other; and the flaw in her feet was a source of beauty,” *Am.* 3.1.9–12).¹⁷ The resulting picture of Venus, while embodying the generic difference between epic and elegy,¹⁸ also points to a fundamental difference between the lesson taught by the Ovidian *praeceptor* and the lesson to be gleaned from the Homeric tale: now, Vulcan is just as open to divine mockery

as were his antagonists in Homer. Venus, too, has a very different part to play in the Ovidian narrative. Whereas she was a compliant but generally passive recipient of Ares's gifts and love in the *Odyssey*, here she is a willing partner, eager to entertain her lover even at the expense of her husband.¹⁹ Venus's epithet *lasciva* (*Ars am.* 2.567) underscores this difference: in erotic contexts it often indicates a degree of sexual aggressiveness and is frequently therefore used by Ovid to describe Cupid himself.²⁰

Two further differences in this part of Ovid's narrative also invite notice: the implication in the word *quotiens* that Venus and Mars met in secret not once before discovery but repeatedly; and the curious attribution to tradition of the details of Venus's mockery of her husband ("risisse . . . / dicitur," "she is said to have laughed," 2.567–68). The first of these novelties is made explicit shortly thereafter, when Ovid uses the plural "concubitus primos" to describe their initial assignations; that this is not simply a poetic plural is implicit in the three imperfect verbs that describe Venus, and Mars's response to her: *decebat, celare solebant, erat* (2.569–72). In Homer, one sexual encounter is enough for Helios, who immediately reports what he has seen to Hephaestus (*Od.* 8.268–71). With the Alexandrian footnote²¹ *risisse . . . / dicitur*, meanwhile, Ovid invites his readers to appreciate the joke: if the story told here is really "the most (in)famous tale in all of heaven" ("fabula . . . toto notissima caelo," *Ars am.* 2.561), then surely his readers will know that the details given here are not in fact part of Homer's narrative at all (and indeed there is no extant authority for this aspect of the story besides Ovid himself).²² Ovid thus calls attention to his own revision of the Homeric story by radically reinterpreting it; the emphasis on repetition in the story, meanwhile, is a neat metatextual comment on Ovid's repetition—with a difference—of the Homeric original.

Yet another difference from the Homeric version emerges in the next couplet (*Ars am.* 2.573–74): while the Homeric Helios was introduced quickly into the tale and just as quickly brought the sorry news to Hephaestus, the Ovidian Sol has been noticeably absent until now—perhaps because his presence earlier in the story would have made repeated assignations less likely (or might Ovid wish slyly to suggest that Sol lingered voyeuristically before informing on the lovers?). The *praeceptor*, who has already expressed a certain dismay at the story with his exclamatory *a*, now intrudes fully into the narrative to apostrophize Sol (2.575–76)—not to chastise him for his late appearance, however, but rather to find fault with the bad example he sets by becoming an informer; much better, the *praeceptor* continues, to remain silent,

and to extract an appropriate reward from Venus for doing so: “pete munus ab ipsa” (“request a gift from her,” 2.575). The word *munus* appears often in elegy, as gift giving is a tried-and-true technique for winning a *puella*’s favor;²³ but it can also be used of the particular powers of a god that that god can bestow on others—with the implication here that Venus could well offer sex to Sol in return for his silence.²⁴

In keeping with the altered function of Ovid’s version of the story, the Homeric emphasis on Hephaestus’s skilled craftsmanship and clever trickery (i.e., τέχνη and δόλος, *Od.* 8.276, 282, 286, 297, 317, 327, 332), culminating in a simile comparing the snare to a spider’s web so fine that not even the gods could detect it (8.280–81), is now, if not entirely elided, yet very much reduced. The snare (*laquei*, *Ars am.* 2.578, 580) is described as difficult to see (*obscurus*, 2.577), and as able to deceive the eye (“lumina fallit opus,” “the work tricks the eyes,” 2.578), but no potential divine viewers are mentioned, and no spider simile is present to enhance Vulcan’s fine work. Instead, the *praeceptor* moves quickly to the next phase of the story. Vulcan feigns a trip to Lemnos, the lovers quickly resume their affair, and just as quickly they are caught in the smith god’s snare, all in a single couplet (2.579–80) instead of the over twenty hexameters of Homeric narrative devoted to these events. Again, the shared desire of the two lovers is bypassed; instead, Ovid moves rapidly to the gathering of gods and the spectacle (*spectacula*, 2.581) created by the ensnared divinities.

Not surprisingly, the treatment of this gathering and its conclusion also differs in the two poems. First, the *Odyssey*: in Demodocus’s song, the assembling of the gods is a response to Hephaestus’s aggrieved outburst to Zeus and the other gods. Aphrodite bears the brunt of his wrath because she shames him (αἰὲν ἀτιμάζει, “she always disgraces him,” *Od.* 8.309), preferring the handsome and surefooted Ares to her ungainly husband, and Hephaestus vows not to release the two gods from their unseemly situation until he receives restitution of the marriage-price from his wife’s (and his own) father, Zeus (8.315–20). The transference to the divine sphere of a declaration of desire to divorce following human legal procedures is, as A. F. Garvie notes, comical;²⁵ and the incongruity of this demand is emphasized by the arrival of the divine witnesses Poseidon, Hermes, and Apollo (8.321–23). The latter two laugh—but their laughter is aimed not at Hephaestus, who earns from them acknowledgment of his skill in catching the lovers (8.329–32), but at Aphrodite and Ares; that they are the target is elaborated and made explicit by a ribald exchange between Apollo and Hermes, the latter of whom expresses his willingness to be ensnared by three times as many snares and to be exposed in this position

to all the other gods in exchange for an opportunity to have sex with Aphrodite (8.334–43). Only Poseidon—the eldest and, presumably, most sober-minded of the three witnesses—restores a semblance of seriousness to the story, asking for Ares’s release (not Aphrodite’s, however) and promising to pay compensation himself if Ares somehow avoids paying the debt (8.344–56). Now presumably satisfied, Hephaestus agrees and releases the lovers; Ares departs straightaway for Thrace, while Aphrodite goes to Paphos, where her nymphs bathe and anoint her and then clothe her in beautiful garments (8.357–66). With this bathing scene, as we have noted, Demodocus draws his song to a close, leaving a vision of Aphrodite’s beauty as the last thing to be imagined by his audience (θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, “a marvel to look upon,” 8.366).

In the *Ars*, on the other hand, suppression of some details and expansion of others effect a very different ending. The *spectacula* mentioned in 2.581, it turns out, do not consist simply of the two exposed and immobilized gods but have Venus at their center—a naked and embarrassed Venus, unable not only to cover her face in shame but also to conceal her private parts (2.582–84). The word *spectacula* relocates the scene quite clearly in a Roman world where spectacles—Circus races, *venationes*, and lewd mimes—constitute a distinct class of public entertainment; indeed, the exposure of Venus’s genitalia suggests nothing so much as the May festival of the Floralia, during which prostitutes are said to have performed nude on stage.²⁶ And it is this sight that stirs the gods’ bawdy humor, as one of them—never named,²⁷ but providing the only example of direct speech in the episode apart from the *praeceptor*’s comments—offers to relieve Mars of his troublesome chains and take them upon himself. In focusing on Venus and obscuring Mercury’s identity, Ovid has not only stripped the story down to its bare essentials but has also reframed it in elegiac terms with the translation of Homer’s δεσμοί as *vincula* (2.586), so suggesting the cliché of *servitium amoris* that is common in elegiac imagery.²⁸ He also elides the language of bride-price and financial compensation for adultery that was central to Hephaestus’s vindication in the *Odyssey*; the *Ars*, after all, is intended to assist the adulterer, not to frame him, and so the liberation of the lovers is effected in a single couplet (2.587–88). The only reminder that actual payment might have been involved is a faint one indeed, embedded in the connotation of “repayment” that the verb *resolvere* can have; but the association with “freeing” (i.e., from imprisonment) that the verb also has seems to be the dominant one here, since Neptune is described as using prayers (“precibus, Neptune, tuis,” “through your prayers, Neptune,” 2.587) to end their entrapment.²⁹

Ovid's treatment of the story in the *Ars* also closes very differently from Homer's. Whereas the earlier treatment had promised Hephaestus at least financial compensation and had ended with the lovers separated—at least for now—the final word in *Ars* 2 is a rebuke of Vulcan for his foolishness in bringing the lovers' dalliance into the public eye. All he will get for his trouble, concludes the *praeceptor*, is shame, since now the lovers will simply continue their affair in public rather than trying to conceal it (2.589–92):

hoc tibi perfecto, Vulcane: quod ante tegebant,
 liberius faciunt, ut pudor omnis abest:
 saepe tamen demens stulte fecisse fateris,
 teque ferunt artis paenituisse tuae.

This is your doing, Vulcan; what they concealed previously, they now do more freely, since all shame is gone; you often, though in a frenzy, confess that you acted foolishly, and they say that you became ashamed of your skill.

For the Ovidian *praeceptor*, the mad love of Mars (2.563) gives way to the far more consequential madness of Vulcan (*demens*), the only character to emerge from the episode permanently shamed. The lovers now can enjoy the openly available luxury of repetition into the permanent present of myth (“*liberius faciunt*”), but the only repetition available to Vulcan is the incessant reminder of his own foolishness (“*saepe . . . stulte fecisse fateris*”). And in a final scathing revision of the moral expressed by Homer's gods, οὐκ ἀρετᾶ κακὰ ἔργα (“bad deeds do not prosper,” *Od.* 8.329), it is now the *ars* of Vulcan that should be blamed for the trouble—an *ars* that, following the *praeceptor*'s logic, can clearly be seen as inferior to the *Ars* of Ovid.

METAMORPHOSES 4:

A HOMERIC LESSON NOT LEARNED

While the tale of Venus and Mars that appears in *Ars* 2 has a clear, if surprising, didactic trajectory, its retelling in *Metamorphoses* 4 is all but entirely devoid of any explicit lesson (though, as we shall see, we are invited by Ovid to tease both didactic and metapoetic functions out of the story). It appears as the introduction to one of three inset narratives, narrated one by one by the daughters of Minyas. The Theban sisters are the only women in the city who reject the worship of Bacchus, and to enact their distaste for the new

cult, they not only refuse to follow the other women who leave their homes and duties to participate in the god's worship (*Met.* 4.1–12), but decide to pass their time indoors, spinning and working at their looms (4.32–35). Their domestic activities evoke traditional women's work as seen repeatedly in ancient literature, beginning with Homeric women like Helen and Penelope; but unlike their Homeric predecessors, they will find that this demonstration of domestic virtue is ineffectual in the face of Bacchus.

The work of spinning and weaving is slow and decidedly repetitive: the careful fingering of clumped wool, drawn piecemeal off the distaff, and its gradual transformation into slender thread as it passes over the spindle; the up-and-down interlacing of the thread as the shuttle carries it row by row across the warp set up on the loom—in its necessary attention to detail and to the establishment of a rhythm, wool working ensures that its practitioners will be focused on their task and fixed in place for long periods of time.³⁰ Gianpiero Rosati (1999) has shown in rich detail how the semantic field of the language used to describe this craft intersects with metaphors for poetic composition in ancient literature, using the episode of the daughters of Minyas in *Metamorphoses* 4 (along with the Arachne and Minerva story in book 6) to illustrate Ovid's play with the simultaneity of poetry and wool working in his narrative. As the sisters spin and weave wool, so they spin and weave song; and the *textus* that results is in both instances a work of refined and discerning art.

By paralleling the work of spinning and weaving with that of composing poetry, Ovid suggests that the sisters' compositions are verbal tapestries—and so approximates their songs to ecphrastic poems that use language to articulate detailed descriptions of works of art.³¹ And in keeping with their rejection of the mass psychology of the women of Thebes, the daughters of Minyas go out of their way to reject common stories. Thus, the first tale, narrated by an unnamed sister, is chosen precisely because it is uncommon: “quoniam vulgaris fabula non est” (*Met.* 4.53). This is the story of the love of Pyramus and Thisbe, set in an exotic locale and filling more than a hundred verses (4.55–166).³² The second tale, almost as long, is narrated by Leuconoe, and her theme is almost as unusual as the first: the loves of the god Sol (4.169–270), focusing on the story of Leucothoe, an eastern princess loved by Sol, and her jealous competitor Clytie.³³ The love story of Venus and Mars serves as a preface to the central narrative of Leuconoe, the connection being Sol's pivotal role in the exposure of the two lovers. While I shall return to this in some detail shortly, it is worth noting here the subordination of the familiar Venus and Mars story to a tale known first to us from Ovid.³⁴ A third sister,

Alcithoe, brings up the rear in this sequence, offering a third story of roughly similar length (4.276–388) and yet again set in an exotic locale (Caria, 4.296–97). Like the first sister to perform, Alcithoe opens her narrative with an explicit rejection of familiar themes (“vulgatos taceo . . . pastoris amores,” “I pass over the common loves of the shepherd,” 4.276), and then launches into the story of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus: a tale that, if not entirely unknown before Ovid, here receives distinctively Ovidian treatment.³⁵ Further contributing to the symmetry of the sequence is the way in which both the first and the last story are selected by their narrators only after the rejection of several other possibilities. Before the first sister takes up Pyramus and Thisbe as her theme, she considers, and rejects, the obscure loves of the Babylonian divinity Dercetis, of Dercetis’s unnamed daughter,³⁶ and of an unnamed nymph (4.44–50). The last narrator, Alcithoe, considers and rejects the unhappy loves of Daphnis and the sexual transformation of Sithon. Finally—in an outburst that recalls Ovid’s earlier comment about the first sister, “nam plurima norat” (“for she knew very many tales,” 4.43)—she packs not one but four other hereby-rejected possibilities into three verses: the transformations of Celmis, of the Curetes, of Crocus, and of Smilax (4.281–83).³⁷

It is in this context—amid a cluster of stories, both told and untold, linked by exotic locales and arcane characters—that the *Metamorphoses* version of the story of Venus and Mars finds itself: strange bedfellows indeed. The central position of the story clearly recalls the tale’s central position in the *Odyssey*—but there, it was the novelty, framed by two tales intimately familiar to Odysseus. Ovid further marks the inversion of the novel and the traditional by featuring the story here not as a central narrative but as a prelude, subordinate to the second sister’s primary tale. I have already noted that the first and last of the three daughters of Minyas make a point of the novelty of their chosen stories (*Met.* 4.53 and 276); the latter of these, Alcithoe, makes the point a second time when, after listing all the stories she plans *not* to tell, she concludes, “praetereo dulcique animos novitate tenebo” (“I bypass them, and will hold your attention with sweet novelty,” 4.284). Then, still not quite done with the point, she begins her description of Salmacis with an indirect question, “unde sit infamis” (“whence comes her notoriety,” 4.285): though *infamis* clearly is intended to anticipate the notoriety that Salmacis will bring upon herself through her sexual aggressiveness, if we think of the adjective as composed of the negative (rather than intensifying) prefix *in* + *fama*, it also suggests another meaning: “without fame,” “unknown”—an appropriate designation for a *récherché* story.

It is striking, then, to revisit the version of the love of Venus and Mars narrated by Leuconoe, marked at both its opening and its conclusion by indications of its repetitive nature. Leuconoe begins by explaining that the loves of Sol will be her theme (“cepit amor Solem: Solis referemus amores,” “love seized the Sun; of the Sun’s loves we shall tell,” 4.170), an explanation that, enhanced by the repetition of Sol’s name, would lead her audience to expect that, with the next line, one of these unfamiliar tales will begin. And the first word of the next verse, *primus*, is promising: it recalls the striking transition Ovid makes from the cosmic narrative with which *Metamorphoses* 1 opens to the first love story in the poem, that of Apollo and Daphne (“Primus amor Phoebi Daphne Peneia,” “the first love of Phoebus was Daphne, daughter of Peneus,” 1.452),³⁸ and its repetition at the end of the following hexameter would seem to underscore the point: “*primus* adulterium Veneris cum Marte putatur / hic vidisse deus; videt hic deus omnia *primus*” (“this god is thought to have been the first to see the adultery of Venus with Mars; this god sees all things first,” 4.171–72). This fleeting echo, however, proves to be false: with the next phrase, “adulterium Veneris cum Marte,” Leuconoe reveals that her real first topic is not an obscure erotic tale about Sol, but rather a story with a long literary pedigree. By the last word of this hexameter, *putatur*, it is clear that the story is a familiar one indeed—the Alexandrian footnote points Leuconoe’s audience indubitably back to Homer. After this opening, Leuconoe’s audience has been reoriented and can be reasonably sure what to expect; and confirmation of their expectation, implicit in the story itself, is underscored with the tale’s final line, announcing the story’s fame (and its notoriety) as it echoes the very first line of the version seen in *Ars* 2: Leuconoe’s signature “haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo” (“this was the most famous tale in all of heaven,” *Met.* 4.189) repeats everything but the verbal tense of the *praeceptor*’s introductory “fabula narratur toto notissima caelo” (*Ars am.* 2.561). Repetition of the mirroring line, opening one version and closing the other, signals not only the repetitiousness of the story but the very incessant character of the activities it details: the love affair of Venus and Mars, already revealed in *Ars* 2 to be habitual, is now used as a foil for the unheard-of stories told by Leuconoe and her sisters, who engage in the repetitious work of weaving as they narrate stories without a history of repetition.

Leuconoe’s compact version of the story (only twenty-one hexameters, and including no direct speech whatsoever) also betrays its reliance on repetition.³⁹ She needs only four unadorned words, “adulterium Veneris cum Marte,” to

introduce the tale, and a single verse to explain Sol's role as informer, thereby connecting the tale to her ostensible theme, "Solis amores." Sol's informing to Vulcan is similarly summary (*Met.* 4.173–74), and only when she arrives at Vulcan's response to the news does Leuconoe linger over the details: in a humorous syllepsis,⁴⁰ the smith god loses both his mind and the object he had been crafting, as the latter falls from his hands ("at illi / et mens et quod opus fabrilis dextra tenebat / excidit," "from his control fell both his mind and the craftsman's project he held," 4.174–76). And then, after an implicit but markedly quick recovery, he immediately sets to work on a new project: a snare in which to catch the lovers.

This snare, described with not one but three words, "catenas / retiaque et laqueos" ("chains and nets and snares," 4.176–77), is in many ways the centerpiece of the story.⁴¹ Its fine execution is illustrated not only by the invisibility of the mesh ("quae lumina fallere possent," "of the sort that was able to deceive the eyes," 4.177, echoing *Ars am.* 2.578, "lumina fallit opus") but also by its comparability to the web of a spider: "non illud opus tenuissima vincant / stamina, non summo quae pendet aranea tigno" ("nor would the finest webs surpass that work, not the spider web that hangs from the highest beam," *Met.* 4.178–79). The use of this simile may be seen as a demonstration of Leuconoe's familiarity with the Homeric version, but she has in fact already shown that with the Alexandrian footnote of 4.171; in singling out this elaborate simile for inclusion in her narration—a simile not found, as we have seen, in the *Ars* 2 version of the story—Leuconoe also wants to remind her sisters of the weaving they are engaged in as they tell stories, and of the way in which their stories can be seen as ecphrastic narratives that they weave with words. Leuconoe thus characterizes the story of Venus and Mars and the handiwork of the Minyeides as simultaneously didactic and metapoetic forms of narrative. On the didactic level, she implies that their sophisticated storytelling, as finely crafted as Vulcan's snare, can immobilize even gods; on the metapoetic level, Ovid uses the story of Venus and Mars to assert the parity of Leuconoe's song with Homeric poetry.⁴² Of course, these audacious parallels also draw attention to an inherent tension on both the didactic and the metapoetic levels of the narrative. In didactic terms, the outcome of the sisters' resistance to Bacchus suggests that their handiwork, unlike Vulcan's, is neither an effective prophylactic nor a vindication in the face of Bacchus's superior skills. In metapoetic terms, Ovid draws attention to the power that *ars* can have, while leaving unanswered the question of whether his appropriation of the Homeric

tale, together with its subordination to other distinctly non-Homeric stories, constitutes an act of aggression on his part or rather an acknowledgment of the inescapability of Homer as model—or both.⁴³

I return to the implications of this reading in my conclusion, but first let us complete our reading of the version of the story in *Metamorphoses* 4. After lingering over the Homeric simile, Leuconoe returns to narrating in summary fashion Vulcan's setting of the snare and the hapless lovers' subsequent entrapment (4.180–84). Leuconoe's repeated emphasis on Vulcan's *ars* (4.181, 183) suggests that he regains his ability to plot revenge very quickly after the shock of Sol's report (cf. *extemplo*, 4.175). The speed of her narrative is foregrounded by the reappearance of *extemplo* a few lines later (4.185), as Vulcan throws open the doors to expose the two ensnared lovers and to admit an assembly of expectant gods (gods who, perhaps because of the repetitions of this very story, now appear to be waiting at the door rather than needing to be summoned, as they were in the Homeric version: compare *Met.* 4.186 with *Od.* 8.305–21). The economy of Leuconoe's narrative culminates in her concluding focus on the witticism made by one of the divine witnesses about his willingness to be embarrassed in a manner similar to Venus and Mars: "illi iacuerre ligati / turpiter, atque aliquis de dis non tristibus optat / sic fieri turpis" ("they lay disgracefully, bound, and one of the gods—not one of the gloomy ones—wishes he might be thus disgraced," 4.186–88). None of the gods present is named, and only the designation "de dis non tristibus" hints at the joker's identity, while the repetition in *turpiter* and *turpis* both glosses over and trivializes the nature of the exposé. Leuconoe's version ends with divine laughter ("superi risere," "the ones above laughed," 4.188), even as it leaves the two lovers apparently trapped permanently by Vulcan's snare. There is now no hurried departure for Thrace or Paphos on the part of Mars and Venus respectively, no restorative bath for Venus, and Vulcan is neither promised compensation for the loss of honor nor chastised for revealing his shame. The story is an entertainment—for its internal audience of gods, for Leuconoe's sisters, and for Ovid's readers—and the fact of its repetitious history, on both the didactic and the metapoetic levels,⁴⁴ makes it the perfect foil for the novelty to follow.

Before we close discussion of this episode, however, it is worth wondering whether Ovid may have had one other connection in mind when he gave this tale to Leuconoe. The sisters, we recall, tell stories to pass the time while wool working, and the webs they weave strongly resemble, I have suggested, the tales they tell as they avoid the Bacchic revelry that possesses the rest of Thebes. The story of the entrapment of Venus and Mars, however, suggests yet a further

narrative inversion, as the sister-storytellers in turn become the subject of song—Ovid’s song—upon their transformation into bats. One of the many potential lessons of the Venus and Mars tale concerns the omniscience of the gods (Sol, in the Homeric tale); another concerns the gods’ entrapment of those who have offended them (Vulcan, in the Homeric tale). These two lessons are in turn transferred to the Minyēides themselves by the Ovidian narrator, as he describes how the sounds of the Bacchic procession, though invisible, fill their room, the air becomes fragrant (4.391–93), and—incredibly—the looms themselves and the webs they support are overpowered and transformed by ivy and grapevines, so that the threads become vines (4.394–98):

resque fide maior, coepere virescere telae
 inque hederæ faciem pendens frondescere vestis;
 pars abit in vites et, quæ modo fila fuerunt,
 palmitæ mutantur; de stamina pampinus exit;
 purpura fulgorem pictis adcommodat uvis.

Then an event greater than belief: the webs began to turn green and the fabric hanging from the loom began to get leaves with the look of ivy; a part turns into vines, and what had previously been threads were exchanged for shoots; a vine stalk comes forth from the loom; purple complements the textile’s brilliance with colorful grapes.

The sisters are thus caught in the act, just as Venus and Mars were; and like Venus and Mars, they are trapped by a divine net, their transformation paralleling in its swiftness the speed of Leuconoe’s earlier narration (cf. *subito*, 4.391). But as the Homeric story, so often repeated, makes clear to its readers, the humiliation of the two gods is ephemeral, and they—and the gods who observe them—will have all of eternity to repeat this episode if they wish. These same readers also know, however, that on the plane of human experience, exemplified in the *Odyssey* by the story of Odysseus himself, such events can have only the most dire consequences. The tale that ends in divine laughter (4.188) will bring no similar laughter to the Minyēides, who are instead swept along by the power of Bacchus to become the objects of song rather than its creators. Unlike the readers of the *Ars*, for whom the story of adultery exposed and of Vulcan’s disgrace is intended as an apotropaic warning, the listeners in this episode are drawn by their weaving and singing into the web of the poem itself.

THE MORAL OF THE STORY

I began this chapter with some general thoughts about the interpretation of Ovidian repetition and proceeded to demonstrate how Ovid interrogates, rewrites, and sometimes challenges his Homeric model. The centrality of repetition to the Ovidian *ars canendi* is a familiar point of entry to the interpretation of Ovid's poetry because it allows—indeed, demands—that his attentive readers question his choices and consider his models even as they make sense of his transformative rewriting. Everything that is new in Ovid's retelling of the story of the loves of Venus and Mars is set into relief against the background provided by the Homeric model; Ovid's sheer delight in his own inventiveness is made almost palpable in the details.

But this is not the end of Ovid's repetitiveness; that is, he does not simply revisit Homer in order to "correct" him or to initiate a display of poetic one-upmanship in which he will inevitably trump a static and fixed model. Rather, what I have tried to show is that Ovid actively enters into the spirit of Homeric composition, finding in the tale of the loves of Venus and Mars a perfect opportunity to engage with Homeric repetitiousness in its own terms. Ovid finds in Homeric narrative itself an invitation to join in the retelling of the tale, a tale that opens up the possibility of endless repetition while never being entirely the same as any of its previous forms.

In so doing, Ovid may well intend simultaneously, if momentarily, to recall yet another repetition of the Homeric tale, the version that appears, only briefly and in a highly allusive context, in the fourth *Georgic* (4.333–47). There, Vergil has begun the story of Aristaeus's appeal to his mother, Cyrene, for her assistance in resuscitating the bees that have inexplicably died. Cyrene hears him as she is sitting in her marine dwelling, surrounded by beautiful nymphs engaged in wool working; another nymph, Clymene,⁴⁵ is entertaining the group with a narrative song to accompany their task. Before turning his focus on Aristaeus, Vergil describes briefly the contents of Clymene's song (G. 4.345–47):

... curam Clymene narrabat inanem
Volcani, Martisque dolos et dulcia furta,
aque Chao densos divum numerabat amores.

... Clymene was narrating the futile love of Vulcan, and Mars's deceptions and stolen pleasures and starting from Chaos was recounting the incessant loves of the gods.

Her song concerns the loves of the gods, going all the way back to the beginning of time and of myth (“aque Chao”); presumably it is a long story indeed, as the epithet *densos* suggests, although Vergil’s readers, unlike the sea nymphs, are not privileged to hear any more of it. But Vergil provides just enough detail to suggest that her song began with a prelude of sorts in which she told of “the futile love of Vulcan, and Mars’s deceptions and stolen pleasures”—in other words, a version of the Homeric story of the loves of Venus and Mars.⁴⁶ Both recent English-language commentators on the *Georgics* draw attention to the rather non-Homeric emphases of this Homeric tale in its new context,⁴⁷ but neither tries to account for the singling out of this story from all the other *divum amores*, or for its primary position in the narrative in spite of the status of Chaos as first beginning of the universe, at least in Hesiodic tradition.⁴⁸ It may well be that this tale earns special treatment by Vergil because of its status as what Ovid will later call a *notissima fabula* (though that identification in itself contains a bit of circular logic); but Ovid’s reception of the story may also allow us to see in the Vergilian allusion a recognition of the tale’s boundless ability to be begun anew and, in the process, to be made new again.

NOTES

1. See especially his discussion of the final books of the *Metamorphoses* (Hinds 1998, 104–22).

2. Cf. Feeney 1991, 30; Halliwell 2008, 82n75; and see the discussion below.

3. In this chapter I focus on Ovid’s two extended repetitions of the Homeric tale. He refers to the episode very briefly on several other occasions in his collected works, including *Am.* 1.9.39–40, “Mars quoque deprensus fabrilis vincula sensit: / notior in caelo fabula nulla fuit”; *Met.* 14.25–27, “At Circe (neque enim flammis habet aptius ulla / talibus ingenium, seu causa est huius in ipsa, / seu Venus indicio facit hoc offensa paterno) / . . .”; and *Tr.* 2.377–78, “quis, nisi Maeonides, Venerem Martemque ligatos / narrat in obsceno corpora presa toro?” See also n. 18 below. Quotations of Latin texts are from the following editions: Kenney 1995 (*Amores* and *Ars amatoria*), Tarrant 2004 (*Metamorphoses*), Owen 1915 (*Tristia*), and Mynors 1969 (Virgil, *Georgics*). References to the *Odyssey* are from Allen 1917. All translations are my own.

4. See n. 2. The one substantial exception to this lack of critical interest in a comparison of Ovid’s two versions is offered by Petersen and Weiss 1985, 48–49; its authors, however, are primarily concerned with cataloguing similarities and differences along generic lines, and they do not attempt to offer an explanation for or interpretation of Ovid’s repetitive practice.

5. See, e.g., Stroh 1979; Holzberg 1990; Sharrock 1994a, 113–22.

6. See, e.g., Leach 1974; von Albrecht 1982; Janan 1994.

7. Hainsworth (in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988 on *Od.* 8.75) notes that this story is not attested elsewhere and suggests that it has been invented to suit the demands of the current narrative. The story has been central to recent work on oral poetics and Homer: for an overview, see Clay 1983, 97–106, 241–46.

8. Concerns about the morality of the story are expressed by, e.g., Xenophanes 21 B 11 D-K and Pl. *Resp.* 390c; see also n. 2 above. On the language of bride-price and restitution, see Garvie 1994 on *Od.* 8.318–19 and 330–32.

9. Burkert 1960 is fundamental to the modern reappraisal of the story; subsequent studies, prominent examples of which are Braswell 1982, Newton 1987, C. Brown 1989, Olson 1989, and Alden 1997, focus on the story's paradigmatic function. Rinon 2006 offers a fine appreciation of the role played by all three of Demodocus's songs as emblematic of the poem as a whole. Bierl 2012 and Hunter 2012, essays in a recent companion to the ancient epyllion, consider generic features of the tale.

10. Ovid's intertextual relationship with Homer has received relatively little scholarly attention: for a notable exception, see Baldo 1986 (pp. 124–30 on this episode).

11. While I have not focused on narratological niceties in this chapter, de Jong 2001, ad loc., draws attention to this story's incorporation of shifting narrative levels.

12. For the bathing scene as a Homeric type scene, see Arend 1933, 124–26. On bathing as preliminary to love, compare *Il.* 14.166–86 (with Janko 1994, ad loc.): Hera begins her preparations for the seduction of Zeus by cleansing herself with ambrosia, anointing herself, and adorning her body with beautiful garments. Both the Iliadic and Odyssean scenes are connected, via Aphrodite, with the bath the goddess takes before her seduction of Anchises in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (h. 5.58–68); on the last of these scenes, see Faulkner 2008; Richardson 2010; Olson 2012, ad loc. Hunter (2012, 91–101) sees in the bathing scene a generic association with hymnic style; see also Baumbach 2012. On the role of the bathing scene as a symbol of renewal and purification, see Tracy 1997, 370–72.

13. Brillet-Dubois (2011, 112) suggests that there is already an ironic humor in Demodocus's transposition of the preparatory scene to the time after intercourse in *Odyssey* 8: "far from being tamed by humiliation, the goddess is replying by getting provokingly ready for another round."

14. With *insanus amor*, Ovid cleverly inverts a Vergilian image: at *Ecl.* 10.44–45, Gallus's "insane love of Mars" (i.e., war) keeps him from his beloved; see Clausen 1994, ad loc.; cf. Janka 1997 on *Ars am.* 2.563–64, and the similar elegiac "disarming" of Mars in *Fast.* 3.1–22, with the discussion of Hinds 1992. The image of Mars that appears here may also owe something to Lucretius, who concludes his introductory hymn to Venus in book 1 with a description of Mars, in the aftermath of intercourse with the goddess, as "overcome by the lasting wound of love" ("aeterno devictus volnere amoris," 1.34); Lucretius, however, is less interested in a voyeuristic representation of the two gods in flagrante (and the potential for humor in such a scene) than in the episode's ability to capture the supremacy of Venus and her power to bring peace.

15. Cf. Janka 1997, ad loc.

16. See also Hollis 1977 on *Ars am.* 1.313, citing Shackleton Bailey 1956, 304–5.

17. On Ovid's depiction of Elegia, see Wyke 2006, 172–82.

18. Elsewhere Ovid uses the pairing of Venus and Vulcan to characterize the combination of “perfect” and “defective” verses that constitutes the elegiac couplet: see *Am.* 2.17.19–20, “Vulcani Venus est, quamvis incude relictā / turpiter obliquo claudicet ille pede. / carminis hoc ipsum genus impar, sed tamen apte / iungitur herous cum brevior modo,” with Morgan 2012, 210.

19. We may also suspect a sly joke regarding the absence of gifts: the expectation of gift giving by a lover to his *puella* is one of the many topics upon which the Ovidian *praeceptor* offers solemn—and stingy—advice to his male readers; see, e.g., *Ars am.* 1.405–36.

20. E.g., *Ars am.* 2.497; *Met.* 1.456; cf. also *Am.* 1.4.21, 1.8.98.

21. The term originates with Ross 1975, 78.

22. “Risisse . . . / dicitur” in the same *sedes* appears also in the programmatic first poem of the *Amores*, characterizing the troublesome god Cupido (*Am.* 1.1.3–4); on the use of the phrase there, see McKeown 1989, ad loc.

23. Cf. n. 19 above.

24. E.g., *Am.* 3.1.60; cf. Janka 1997, ad loc.; *OLD* s.v. *munus* 5b; Adams 1982, 164.

25. Garvie 1994 on *Od.* 8.318–19.

26. Valerius Maximus (2.10.8) and Seneca (*Ep.* 97.8) both tell how Cato absented himself from naughty stage shows at the Floralia in order not to put a damper on the festive spirits of the *populus*; see also Wiseman 1999; 2002, 293–99.

27. In yet another instance of compression: Demodocus mentions a τῆς among the gods who utter witticisms at the sight of the ensnared gods (*Od.* 8.328), but then specifies that Hermes is the one who is willing to change places with Ares; Ovid's *praeceptor*, on the other hand, invites his readers to remember, or to guess at, the identity of the unnamed voyeur—and in the process to become voyeurs themselves.

28. For a recent survey of the conventional imagery of elegy, see Kennedy 2012.

29. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *resolvo* 2, 6.

30. For a helpful introduction to the techniques involved, see Barber 1992; for their literary deployment, Snyder 1981 is a useful introduction. Pantelia (1993) is rightly insistent about the very different work of spinning on the one hand and weaving on the other, but the differences she emphasizes are not central to the scene in the *Metamorphoses*.

31. On the ecphrastic character of their work, see Leach 1974, 107–11.

32. Knox 1988 considers carefully the possibility that other versions of the story were known in antiquity, though we have no evidence of a source before Ovid.

33. For the combination of eastern setting and arcane stories, see Myers 1994a, 79–80.

34. Though Ovid may well have found some version of the story of Leucothoe and Clytie in an earlier source: see Cameron 2004, 290–303. In any case, there is certainly some irony, as Laurel Fulkerson has pointed out to me, in the use of the name *Clytie*, “renowned female,” for such an obscure character.

35. For Ovid’s version of the story, see Labate 1993; Robinson 1999; and cf. the collection of references in Barchiesi and Rosati 2007, ad loc.

36. Identified elsewhere as Semiramis: see Bömer 1976, ad loc.

37. For the ancient evidence relating to each of these myths, see Bömer 1976, ad loc.; Barchiesi and Rosati 2007, ad loc.

38. The repetition of *primus* is noted by Barchiesi and Rosati 2007, ad loc.; on the pivotal role of the Apollo and Daphne story, see Nicoll 1980.

39. Bömer (1976 on 4.167–89) notes the speed and brevity of this version; cf. also his note on 4.186.

40. Tissol 1997 is the standard discussion of this rhetorical device in Ovid; for other examples with *excidit*, see Bömer 1976, ad loc.

41. On the concept of the ecphrastic centerpiece, see Thomas 1983.

42. Cf. Rinon 2006, 212–13, for a discussion of the parallels between Hephaestus’s craftsmanship and Demodocus’s singing.

43. I intend to develop more fully elsewhere the complex interlacing of Homeric emulation, allusion, revision, reinterpretation, and deconstruction that characterizes much of Ovid’s corpus; see the first steps in this direction in Boyd 2012.

44. Note the adverb in the closing frame “*diuque* / haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo” (4.188–89): it acknowledges the story’s long pedigree while hinting that it has recently been, or may soon be, replaced.

45. Fulkerson notes that Vergil, like Ovid, includes among his named characters one whose name means “famed female”: see n. 34 above. Ziogas (2013, 82) observes that Clymene also appears as the name of one of the many former lovers rejected by Sol in favor of Leucothoe at *Met.* 4.204–8—in this instance, the Clymene who, as mother of Phaethon, had appeared first at *Met.* 1.756.

46. Ziogas (2013, 109–10) notes a number of significant connections between and among Vergil’s Clymene and the weaving storytellers of Ovid (i.e., the Minyeides and Arachne), demonstrating that they all perform Hesiodic catalogue poetry; he does not, however, attempt to account for the nonsequential placement of the Venus and Mars story in the song of Vergil’s Clymene.

47. Thomas 1988, ad loc.; Mynors 1990, ad loc.

48. Nor for that matter does Erren (2003, ad loc.), although he comments extensively on the register of the diction in the scene.

Ovid's Cycnus and Homer's Achilles Heel

PETER HESLIN

“**L**uke, I am your “father.”¹ The best sequels do not simply append a chronological supplement to a canonical narrative; by supplying new background information, they invite the audience to go back and re-experience the original in an entirely new light. Such is the particular sense of repetition that I want to invoke in this chapter. When Ovid replays the Trojan War, he is careful to work in the margins of Homer's text, never explicitly contradicting it. He breezes with apparent blitheness and only a handful of words over the events of the *Iliad*, and so in a very literal sense he might be said to avoid repetition with the utmost diligence. But on a more profound level, Ovid invites his readers to re-experience the whole of the *Iliad* in a new light afforded by his wholesale undermining of the objectivity of the epic voice. I argue here that Ovid offers new information in book 12 of the *Metamorphoses* that invites us to infer that the Iliadic narrative is a self-serving lie, invented by Achilles and promulgated naïvely by Homer.

The most satisfying kind of prequel or sequel provides information that undermines or contradicts the assumptions of the original text. The audience is invited to replay the original narrative in the light of surprising new information that seems at first glance utterly incompatible. The pleasure lies in gradually re-examining the canonical text and finding that this new way of seeing the characters is in fact not excluded by the first text. The sequel thus reveals an unseen layer in the original text that may well never have been conceived of by the original authors. The full cleverness of the prequel/sequel can only be appreciated by re-viewing the first text, if only in the mind's eye, in the light of the new information.

I intend to demonstrate that Ovid's Cycnus episode is just such a subversive prequel to the *Iliad*. That is to say, it invites us to think through the plot

of Homer's epic in the light of new information about Achilles that would appear at first sight to contradict Homer flatly. As we replay Homer's plot in the light of Ovid's interpretation, we realize that, surprisingly—shockingly—there is nothing there to contradict the upside-down version of events that Ovid has suggested. The canonical status of the *Iliad* means that Ovid is obliged to proceed in a very subtle manner. If he had simply offered an alternative version of the Trojan War, much as the daughters of Pierus narrated a topsy-turvy version of the Gigantomachy (*Met.* 5.318–31), he could have been dismissed as a crank, much as the Muses dismiss the Pierides. Ovid's decision to undermine Homer by working within the boundaries of his text makes for a much more subtle critique of the epic tradition, and one that cannot be dismissed out of hand.

CYCNUM AND EPIC NARRATIVE

The Cycnus episode occupies a very prominent position in the prequel to Homer's *Iliad* that Ovid composes in the twelfth book of the *Metamorphoses*. The book begins with the abduction of Helen and the mustering of the Greek fleet at Aulis (12.1–38). Then comes the important programmatic interlude of the house of Fama (39–63), followed by the landing of the Greek fleet and the death of Protesilaus (64–71). So far the narrative proper has been very swift, going over familiar episodes with quick brushstrokes.² When the pace of the story finally slows down to dwell upon an episode from the Trojan War in detail, it is for the battle between Achilles and Cycnus, son of Poseidon. Little is known about the details of this story before Ovid, but some facets can be reconstructed. The summary of Proclus tells us that the episode was narrated by the *Cypria*, which was the prequel to the *Iliad* in the epic cycle. Pindar groups Cycnus with Hector and Memnon as among Achilles's greatest foes.³ A passage in Aristotle (*Rh.* 1396b) confirms that view and adds the information that Cycnus was invulnerable and that his efforts had initially prevented the Greeks from landing at Troy. In the version owing to Apollodorus (*Epit.* 3.29–31), the Trojans and their allies had attempted to prevent the landing of the Greeks by throwing rocks at the invasion fleet. Protesilaus manages to land but is killed by Hector.⁴ Achilles, who had been warned by his mother not to be the first ashore, now lands with his Myrmidons. He kills Cycnus by throwing a stone at his head. Nothing is said in this highly elliptical, epitomized version of Apollodorus about Cycnus's invulnerability, but the fact that Achilles used a stone to kill him very probably implies it. That is to say, his body was impervious to cutting but not to other forms of violence. Lycophron

confirms the manner of his death with a riddling allusion to Cynus being struck on the collarbone with a millstone.⁵

These Greek versions probably go back to the *Cypria*, whose narrative can be reconstructed tentatively on their basis. We may surmise that Cynus was the first person, or perhaps just the first hero, killed by Achilles at Troy; he was therefore the counterpart on the Trojan side of Protesilaus. Cynus had prevented the Greeks from landing initially, and when he was killed it was a major setback for the Trojans. He was invulnerable to weapons, so Achilles was forced to kill him with a large stone. This parallels the stones the Trojans were earlier hurling at the Greek fleet; it would be fitting if Achilles killed Cynus with one of the very stones he himself had earlier thrown at the Greeks. The stone-throwing was thus a very prominent aspect of the original narrative, and it is significant that this is the one point on which Ovid does not agree. Ovid has Achilles make increasingly desperate and comical attempts to kill Cynus, until he finally decides to strangle him with the straps of his adversary's own helmet. As Cynus had previously boasted to Achilles that he only wore armor as decoration, this version of his death is also neatly ironic, as Achilles turns this needless decoration against its wearer. But I argue below that Ovid's agenda of subverting Homer's Achilles required him to show Achilles attempting to wound Cynus with a bladed weapon. Ovid's elimination of the death by stone-throw was therefore meant to be noticed by the reader: it signposted the fact that the nature of Achilles's initial violence against Cynus with an edged weapon is highly significant here.

The slapstick aspect of Achilles's efforts to kill Cynus in Ovid's version certainly did not come from the *Cypria*. Pindar and Aristotle attest that killing the fearsome Cynus was one of Achilles's noblest deeds. But there is one more Greek source that might have given Ovid the idea of presenting this episode in a comedic light. Sophocles's *Poimenes* (*Shepherds*) survives only in a handful of fragments (F 497–521 Radt), but a scholiast tells us that it dealt with the killing of Protesilaus by Hector (497). One of the fragments is attributed to a speech by Cynus (501), another seems to mention his name (499), and a third refers to a man whose body is not affected by bronze or iron (500), so it is reasonably certain that it also dealt with our episode.⁶ Ralph Rosen (2003) has recently made a new case for the argument that this was not a tragedy but a satyr play. The evidence he adduces about its diction is not conclusive, as he admits, but the topics of many of the fragments seem oddly pedestrian for an elevated genre. If that is right, it suggests that Ovid was not the first to treat this episode in a humorous fashion. The usual argument in

favor of considering this play as a tragedy seems to be that the start of the Trojan War would be an unlikely topic for a lighthearted treatment. But Ovid shows precisely how this might be done.⁷

In Ovid's telling, Cynus is a mincing and supercilious hero. This unmanly aspect of his character may also be traditional. Theocritus calls Cynus "feminine in his complexion."⁸ A scholion on that passage tells us that according to Hellanicus, his skin was white from birth.⁹ The whiteness of his complexion was clearly related not only to his femininity but also to his name and to his final transformation into a swan, which Ovid probably also drew from the existing tradition. Athenaeus reports that such a metamorphosis was told in the *Ornithogony* of Boeus or Boeo, a work that was imitated in Latin by Vergil's friend Aemilius Macer, whose recitations Ovid attended as a young man.¹⁰ The unmasculine and rather foppish nature of Cynus's style of warfare has been the focus of a recent interpretation of the episode by Möller (2003). She reads this scene as the confrontation of two different poetics, where Achilles represents the traditional Homeric hero and Cynus the hero of a more novel kind of discourse, Alexandrian and Ovidian. The appeal of such an approach is that it fits perfectly with a standard story-pattern in the *Metamorphoses* whereby the representative of a nonclassical narrative mode is crushed by the representative of old-fashioned tradition. On this analysis, Cynus stands in the line of the Pierids and Arachne. This approach has been further elaborated by Sophia Papaioannou:¹¹

It is this literary clash between two fundamentally different genre definitions and "ideal" hero-portrayals that defines the conduct of Achilles and Cynus, as the former represents the Homeric system of epic performance while the latter embodies epic heroism as revisited in the *Metamorphoses*. And the absurdity of this antagonism causes Achilles' conduct to appear comical.

These are important approaches to reading the Cynus episode, but I believe they do not explain all of its features.¹² I offer here a reading that can complement these other interpretations. In particular, my reading better explains how, even though Achilles defeats Cynus, Homer emerges as the loser in his confrontation with Ovid.

Another advantage of the approach offered here is that it can explain what seems to me the most peculiar feature of the Cynus episode: its apparent failure to fit into the overall Ovidian project in books 12 and 13 of undermining the epistemological basis of the epic tradition. One can sketch out an

interpretation of these two books in which every other episode fits into that overall plan. Thus, after the prelude at Aulis, book 12 begins with the house of Fama. As many scholars have noted, this means that Ovid's narrative of the Trojan War begins not with the invocation of an omniscient Muse but with an evocation of the utter unreliability of human report (see Zumwalt 1977; Hardie 2012, 150–77). In Ovid's Troy there is no goddess to guarantee the truth of the narrative; the only guarantee here is that every story has a teller who is trying to sell you a bill of goods. This is very different from the more limited role Fama plays in the *Aeneid*; here, she has usurped the role of the Muses. They are also absent as the givers of inspiration in Ovid's own epic proem (*Met.* 1.1–4); his Muses are merely characters in the epic and thus fallible, tententious, self-interested narrators like everyone else in it. Battle narrative, like all narrative in Ovid, depends not on the daughters of Memory but on human memory, which is inherently subject to failure and bias (Rosati 2002, 299). Immediately after the death of Cynus, we see this at work in Nestor's long narrative of the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs (see Reed 2013, 399–401). He begins by noting that he, as a man of enormous age, has forgotten many things, but that most of them he remembers, including the story he is about to tell. The story thus begins with the narrator protesting his ability to remember its details, despite the gap in time and his own advancing age (12.182–84):¹³

tum senior: "quamvis obstet mihi tarda vetustas,
multaque me fugiant primis spectata sub annis
plura tamen memini."

Then said the older man, "though the slowness of age impedes me and many things seen in my earliest years escape me, there are, even so, more that I do remember."

Nestor's battle narrative is replete with names and the kind of blow-for-blow detail we associate with Homeric epic. He also recounts, apparently word-for-word, many verbal exchanges across the battlefield. He even knows most of the details of the love between Cyllarus and Hylonome, though not all of them (12.426–28):

ut videt exstinctum, dictis, quae clamor ad aures
arcuit ire meas, telo, quod inhaeserat illi,
incubuit moriensque suum complexa maritum est.

When she saw that he was dead, after saying things that the shouting kept from getting to my ears, she fell upon the weapon that had stuck into him and, dying, she embraced her husband.

Nestor's momentary acknowledgment of a constraint on his ability to hear everything forces the audience to consider how he managed to hear the other speeches he has reported. A similar moment comes a few lines later (12.459–61):

quinque neci Caeneus dederat Styphelumque Bromumque
Antimachumque Elymumque securiferumque Pyracmon:
vulnera non memini, numerum nomenque notavi.

Caeneus had sent five to their deaths, Styphelus, Bromus, Antimachus, Elymus, and axe-bearing Pyracmos; I do not remember the wounds, but I did make a note of the number and the name.

Once again, Nestor's admission of a tiny gap in his memory opens up the question of the reliability of all of the other details.¹⁴ Given that he was a member of the enemy force, how is it that Nestor's knowledge of the individual names of the Centaurs killed by Caeneus is better than his memory of the wounds he claims to have seen them suffer? Was he really taking notes while fighting (*notavi*, 461)? Nestor attributes his narrative prowess to memory, but we have to wonder where else it may be faulty, especially in the light of the extraordinarily omniscient and Homeric style of his battle narrative. Ovid's humor stems from a long-established critique of the implausible and unrealistic nature of traditional epic battle narrative, as voiced, for example, by Theseus in Euripides's *Suppliant Women* (846–56):¹⁵

ἐν δ' οὐκ ἐρήσομαι σε, μὴ γέλωτ' ὄφλω,
ὅτῳ ξυνέστη τῶνδ' ἕκαστος ἐν μάχῃ
ἢ τραῦμα λόγχης πολεμίων ἐδέξατο.
κενοὶ γὰρ οὔτοι τῶν τ' ἀκουόντων λόγοι
καὶ τοῦ λέγοντος, ὅστις ἐν μάχῃ βεβῶς
λόγχης ἰούσης πρόσθεν ὀμμάτων πυκνῆς
σαφῶς ἀπήγγειλ' ὅστις ἐστὶν ἀγαθός.
οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην οὔτ' ἐρωτῆσαι τάδε
οὔτ' αὖ πιθέσθαι τοῖσι τολμῶσιν λέγειν·

μόλις γὰρ ἂν τις αὐτὰ τὰναγκαί' ὀρᾶν
 δύναιτ' ἂν ἐστὼς πολέμοις ἐναντίος.

One thing I will not ask you, in case I am thought ridiculous: which of the enemy each of them clashed with in battle, sustaining the deadly thrust of the spear. Such reports are worthless, doing no service to the teller or his listeners; how can a man who is in a battle, with volleys of spears flying before his eyes, give a reliable account of where courage has been shown? I could neither ask a question like this nor put any trust in those who presume to answer it. A man facing the enemy head on could barely see beyond his own immediate danger.

The difference here is that the critique is voiced within the epic itself, causing the narrative to self-deconstruct. The few gaps Nestor acknowledges in his memory are small in themselves, but they destroy the suspension of disbelief, and we are compelled to contemplate the absurdity of Nestor's claim to know all this at first hand.

It is not only a failing memory that puts us on guard in relation to the reliability of Nestor's version of events; he has consciously warped it to suit his own purposes. Immediately after Nestor concludes his tale, he is challenged by one of his hearers on its bias. Tlepolemus notes that Nestor has omitted any mention of the role of his father, Hercules, in the battle. Nestor freely admits that he has suppressed it because of an old antipathy between them ("fortia facta silendo," 12.575). It is the participants in a heroic action whose biased, personal narratives shape our knowledge of events. When Tlepolemus says that he has heard a different version of the battle of Lapiths and Centaurs than Nestor's, it harks directly back to the multiplicity of narrators in Ovid's description of the cave of Fama ("auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor," 12.58). Nestor admits to deliberate suppression of the truth, and we may also suspect that he has deliberately invented other aspects of his narrative. It is Achilles who requests that Nestor tell the story, and it is remarkable how prominent and heroic a role is played in it by Peleus, Achilles's father (12.366–92). Peleus does not form part of the tale of the Lapiths and Centaurs in most other versions, and the reader is compelled to suspect that Ovid's Nestor has not only removed Hercules from the story, but has imported Achilles's father in his place.¹⁶ Thus the contours of Nestor's story are determined by revenge, flattery, and forgetfulness.

Nestor's omission of Hercules and his insertion of Peleus into his narrative permit us to witness precisely the sort of manipulation of the mythical

tradition that, as I argue in the next section, Achilles himself managed to accomplish. Tlepolemus objects that his father had often (*saepe*, 12.540) told the story that he himself had defeated the Centaurs (“domitos a se,” 12.541). But this is not part of the myth as we know it. At first we must assume either that Tlepolemus is lying now or that Hercules had earlier lied to his son. It is certainly possible to envisage Hercules exaggerating his own valor and taking all of the credit for any communal enterprise. But why would Hercules insert himself into a myth that he had nothing to do with, in the light of the vast number of legitimate exploits he already had to boast of? If this was a lie by Hercules, we should expect Nestor to leave the contradiction hanging in the air, perhaps noting merely that he remembers the events differently. Nestor could have suggested that Tlepolemus has confused this episode with his father’s somewhat similar fight against Pholus and those intoxicated Centaurs. If Ovid had stopped there, his purpose of highlighting the subjectivity of mythic narrative and the role of Fama would have been served.¹⁷ A very strange thing then happens.

Even though, on this point, Nestor’s version of events is aligned with our own authorities, he admits that Tlepolemus is right, and that Hercules did indeed take part. That is to say, despite their animosity, Nestor and Hercules both agree, against our own information, that the latter participated in the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs. It would have been easier for Nestor to lead his audience to believe that on this point he was right, and we would have believed him. Instead, he needlessly admits that he was guilty of suppressing the truth. We must conclude, therefore, that Ovid means to imply that Hercules really did take part in the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs and that the canonical mythological tradition is in error on this point. We are the recipients of a flawed tradition from which Hercules has been wrongly air-brushed out.¹⁸ Moreover, Ovid shows us exactly how this was accomplished. Nestor repeatedly told the story of the Lapith battle, all through his long life, always leaving out his enemy Hercules. On rare occasions, like this one, his omission was noticed; but this did not usually happen. Eventually, his censored version became canonical, as he outlived all the other participants who might have told the truth. On this reading, the excision of Hercules and the inclusion of Peleus are contrasting examples of Nestor’s conscious efforts to distort myth. His inclusion of Peleus in this tale did not become canonical for us, because it was an off-hand ad hoc invention, designed to please a particular hearer, Achilles, on this particular occasion. He had no reason to repeat that lie. Hercules, however, was his sworn enemy, so his omission will have been

consistent and deliberate. We are the inheritors not of mythic truth, but of Nestor's self-serving distortions. Ovid dramatizes the fallibility of the mythic tradition, showing its fatal flaw: the lack of any objective authority. Myth depends fatally upon the tendentious self-reporting of the biased participants. As we will see in a moment, Nestor's success in deliberately removing Hercules from the later tradition of the Lapith story mirrors Achilles's success at air-brushing an awkward fact about himself from most of the tradition and particularly from Homer. As with Nestor, strategic silence is all it took to erase almost entirely from the epic record an inconvenient fact about himself.

Book 12 of the *Metamorphoses* comes to a rapid end after Nestor falls silent. Poseidon still holds a grudge because of Cynus's death, and so he and Apollo arrange for Paris to fire the arrow that kills Achilles. Ovid does not say what part of the body it hit; as we will see, he is careful to suppress the myth of Achilles's heel from the surface of the *Metamorphoses*, even as he alludes to it. The book ends, having skipped blithely from Cynus to the death of Achilles, right over the death of Hector and ten years of war, by looking forward to the aftermath of Achilles's death: the judgment of his arms. This story occupies the first half of the next book, and here too the self-serving nature of soldiers' stories is a central feature. Ulysses and Ajax strive to embellish their own deeds and disparage those of their rival with the tactics of lawyers rather than warriors. This, then, serves to define the nature of the discourse of soldiers on the subject of their own feats. That is how Ovid introduced Nestor's narrative (12.159–62):

sed noctem sermone trahunt, virtusque loquendi
 materia est: pugnas referunt hostisque suasque,
 inque vices adita atque exhausta pericula saepe
 commemorare iuvat.

But they drew out the night with conversation, and courage was the subject of their talk; they related the fights of both the enemy and their own, and they took delight in recalling, in turn, again and again, the dangers they had met and overcome.

The narcissism implicit in Ovid's description of soldiers warming over their own past deeds is made explicit as we hear the self-serving discourses of Nestor, Ulysses, and Ajax. Hence, the Troy story that has come down to us

is rooted not in the objective report of heroism, but in subjective self-aggrandizement. As a critique of Homeric narrative, this works all the better in that it is rooted in a quintessential Homeric moment. In a famous episode from the ninth book of the *Iliad*, the sulking Achilles passes the time by playing the lyre and singing of the famous deeds of heroes (9.185–89). Many have wondered which heroes Achilles, himself the quintessential hero, would have sung of. That momentary Homeric collapse of the distinction between bard and hero is what gives Ovid his opening to depict the entire Trojan enterprise as the result of self-praise.¹⁹

So from the house of Fama and the arrival of the Greek fleet at the beginning of book 12, to the capture of Troy and the death of Priam at the middle of book 13, the continuous Trojan War narrative of the *Metamorphoses* can be described as having one theme: undermining the objectivity of Homeric narrative. In this interpretation, the Cynus episode stands out as an oddity. It does not seem to fit that theme at all. Those interpretations that have read it as an allegory on epic narrative have to face up to the fact that Achilles wins. If Cynus does nothing more than to serve as a non-Homeric hero, then he cannot really undermine Homer. We do not get the sense that he ought to have defeated Achilles in a fair fight, as we do for Arachne in her confrontation with classicism, as represented by Minerva. So Cynus does not, at first sight, seem to fit in book 12. What I hope to do now is show that, on the contrary, the Cynus episode is Ovid's most sustained and serious effort to undermine the trustworthiness of Homeric narrative.

THE INVULNERABILITY OF ACHILLES

The first place to look for a key to the significance of the Cynus episode is the way Ovid weaves it into his narrative tapestry. As Achilles's first victim, Cynus starts the Trojan story, but his link to the Lapith story that follows is thematic rather than chronological. The battle of the Lapiths and the Centaurs is a frame for the tale of one of the combatants, Caenis/Caeneus. After the encounter with the invulnerable Cynus, the Greek warriors sit around talking about this odd phenomenon. This prompts Nestor to remember another such case that he is familiar with (12.165–71):

visum mirabile cunctis,
quod iuvenis corpus nullo penetrabile telo
invictumque a vulnere erat ferrumque terebat.
hoc ipse Aeacides, hoc mirabantur Achivi,

cum sic Nestor ait: "vestro fuit unicus aevo
contemptor ferri nulloque forabilis ictu
Cycnus."

It seemed amazing to them all that the young man's body could be penetrated by no weapon, that it was unconquered by wounds and that it wore iron down. At this, Aeacides himself, at this the Achaeans were marveling, when Nestor spoke thus, "In your lifetime there was a single despiser of the sword, pierceable by no blow, Cycnus."

Nestor says that there was another invulnerable hero in the previous generation, but that in the present age, Cycnus was unique. But is Nestor right? There was another hero of the Trojan era who, in some versions of the story, was blessed with an almost entirely invulnerable body. The usual scholarly attitude toward the tale of Achilles's heel is that, since it is attested only after Ovid, it cannot be relevant here. Moreover, since Achilles is wounded in the *Iliad*, the story is not relevant to Homer. Both of these points are technically true, but we will see that the matter is not quite so simple as that.

The one piece of information that the average person today knows about Achilles is that he was vulnerable in his heel. The story runs that Achilles was dipped as a baby into the river Styx by his mother, Thetis, and was thus rendered invulnerable apart from the place on the heel where she held him. As is well known, this story is not attested in Homer or indeed anywhere in Greek literature. Its first appearance is in the Latin *Achilleid* of Statius, about a century after Ovid's epic, as discussed in detail below. For now, the crucial thing to note is that there is little chance that the story was invented in the century between Ovid and Statius. The way in which the latter poet takes for granted that his readers will know what he is talking about when he alludes to the story virtually guarantees that it was not for him a recent invention. If that is the case, we can also conclude with some confidence that Ovid and his readers were likewise familiar with the story of Achilles's partial invulnerability. Let us try reading the scene just after the defeat of Cycnus, where the Greeks discuss the phenomenon of invulnerability, in the light of the assumption that many of Ovid's readers knew of the story of Achilles's own invulnerability. The discussion immediately becomes much, much funnier.

Ovid says that all of the heroes in attendance were amazed at the display of invulnerability that they had just witnessed ("visum mirabile cunctis," 12.165).

The amazement of the Greeks at this strange and new phenomenon is emphasized so often in this scene that it invites the reader to wonder what Ovid is up to here. Moreover, Achilles himself repeatedly feigns amazement at a phenomenon that, in one version of his own mythical biography, applied to himself. After describing the invulnerable body of Cynus, Ovid says, “hoc ipse Aeacides.” The knowledgeable reader might have been expecting a verb like *ferebat*, confirming that Achilles had the very same kind of body as Cynus; but Ovid finishes, “. . . hoc mirabantur Achivi.” Instead of acknowledging Achilles’s similarity to Cynus, Ovid reinforces the sense that Achilles is feigning ignorance by echoing the general Greek wonderment that such a thing was possible. Then comes Nestor’s gratuitous assertion that Cynus was unique in the present generation of heroes. Why does he specify this fact so precisely? The joke is that we know it is not true, and another such hero is sitting right next to Nestor. We may conclude that the Greeks do not know of Achilles’s partial invulnerability, but presumably Achilles knows this about himself. Why does he say nothing?

Here is Achilles’s evasive response (12.175–79):

monstri novitate moventur,
quisquis adest, narretque rogant; quos inter Achilles:
“dic age, nam cunctis eadem est audire voluntas,
o facunde senex, aevi prudentia nostri,
quis fuerit Caeneus . . .”

They were excited by the strangeness of the miracle, all who were present, and they asked him to tell of it; and among them, Achilles said, “Come, speak, for we all have the same wish to hear, O eloquent old man, the wisdom of our age, who Caeneus was . . .”

For the third time in this brief space of ten lines, Ovid describes the total amazement and astonishment of the Greeks at the unfamiliar phenomenon of invulnerability. First, they are all amazed at Cynus (“visum mirabile cunctis,” 12.165); then Nestor cites the sex change of Caeneus as a second wonder on top of his invulnerability (“id mirum magis,” 12.169); at this the Greeks are again amazed, and Ovid emphasizes their unfamiliarity with these aspects of Caeneus (“monstri novitate moventur,” 12.175). Ovid must be up to something here. Why does he needlessly repeat the fact that the Greeks were so amazed? Why does Nestor needlessly assert that Cynus was unique among

the present generation? What Ovid is doing, I argue, is prompting us to recall the story of Achilles's heel and to wonder whether it will feature here. When it does not, we must wonder whether Achilles is deliberately refraining from mentioning it.

Achilles joins the crowd in professing amazement at the unfamiliar idea of invulnerability. He then carefully steers the conversation away from the present generation and toward this earlier invulnerable figure. He is given several opportunities here to bring up his own special qualities. He says nothing, and the ignorant reader who is not aware of that alternative tradition is, like the other Greeks, none the wiser. But to the reader who is aware of the tradition of Achilles's heel, the silence of Achilles begins to look deeply shameful. The knowledgeable reader realizes that book 12 is structured around three gender-bending heroes who all happen to be invulnerable: Cynus, with his unmasculine dandyism; Achilles, after his cross-dressed sojourn on Scyros; and the sex-changing Caenis/Caeneus. Despite the obvious differences between Cynus and Achilles, the two turn out to have a lot in common.²⁰

HOMER'S BIG LIE

When the Greek heroes discuss the phenomenon of invulnerability, the reader's awareness of the silence of Achilles about his own life provides a nicely ironic twist. Just as Nestor and Hercules tell different versions of the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs, so there are different versions of Achilles's life, of which Homer's is just one among many. We can take this contrast with Homer further, and to do so we must look at the problematic fact about the story of Achilles's heel noted above: its apparent incompatibility with the *Iliad*. The linchpin of the view that the story of Thetis dipping Achilles in the Styx is incompatible with Homer is a minor episode in the *Iliad* where Achilles is apparently injured. He never suffers a major wound that requires medical attention, but at one point his skin seems to be pierced. This superficial injury would seem to be enough to prove that the story of invulnerability was incompatible with Homer. In book 21 Achilles is fighting against the ambidextrous Asteropaeus, who throws two spears at once. One hits Achilles's divinely made shield but fails to penetrate its layer of gold. The other spear grazes Achilles's arm (21.166–67): τῷ δ' ἑτέρῳ [sc. δουρί] μιν πῆχυν ἐπιγράβδην βάλε χειρὸς / δεξιτερῆς, σὺτο δ' αἶμα κελαινεφές ("and with the other [spear] he struck a grazing blow to the right forearm of Achilles, and the black blood shot forth").²¹ The scholia note that Asteropaeus is the only hero to wound Achilles. An important inference is made from this event a few hundred lines later by Agenor.

As he deliberates over whether to flee or to confront Achilles, he reflects on what has just happened (21.568–70):

καὶ γάρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρώς ὀξείῃ χαλκῶ,
ἐν δὲ ἰα ψυχῇ, θνητὸν δέ ἔφασ' ἀνθρώποι
ἔμμεναι.

In truth even his flesh too is vulnerable to the sharp bronze, and in him is but one life, and men deem him to be mortal.

The word for “vulnerable” (τρωτὸς) is a Homeric *hapax*, and it highlights the uniqueness of this moment where Achilles is revealed to be vulnerable to weapons.²² But is Agenor correct?

What Ovid does in his narrative of the battle between Cycnus and Achilles is undermine the basis of Agenor’s inference in *Iliad* 21. Achilles repeatedly tries to wound Cycnus by throwing his spear against him. Three times he hits his opponent, who offers his body freely, but the spear has no effect (*Met.* 12.82–101). At this point the puzzled Achilles stops to wonder what is wrong. He inspects his spear, to ensure that it is intact; he reviews his victims, to reassure himself of his strength.²³ Finally, to prove that everything is still functioning, he uses his spear to kill a humble Lycian soldier, Menoetes, who is standing nearby. This is a comical scene on a number of levels.

The ease with which Achilles dispatches Menoetes highlights how unusual it is for Achilles to have to struggle to kill Cycnus; this death undermines Cycnus’s status as Achilles’s first victim at Troy; and it also demonstrates eloquently how the lesser characters in Homeric epic serve as nothing more than disposable props for the heroes to kill in order to display their might.²⁴ After the death of Menoetes, Achilles removes his spear from the corpse. Then an odd thing happens that has a deeper purpose than mere slapstick comedy (12.119–27):

extrahit illud idem calido de vulnere telum
atque ait: “haec manus est, haec qua modo vicimus, hasta.
utar in hoc isdem; sit in hoc, precor, exitus idem!”
sic fatus Cycnum repetit, nec fraxinus errat
inque umero sonuit non evitata sinistro;
inde velut muro solidaque a caute repulsa est.
qua tamen ictus erat, signatum sanguine Cycnum

viderat et frustra fuerat gavisus Achilles;
vulnus erat nullum, sanguis fuit ille Menoetae.

He drew that same weapon from the warm wound and said, "This is the hand, this the spear with which I have just conquered. I shall use the same ones on him; on him, I pray, may the outcome be the same!" Thus he spoke and aimed at Cynus again, and the ash spear did not stray but rang inescapably against his left shoulder; from there it bounced off as if from a wall or a solid cliff. But where Cynus had been struck, Achilles saw that he was stained with blood, and he rejoiced in vain; there was no wound, the blood was Menoetes'.

Cynus is stained with blood where Achilles's spear hit him. Achilles at first makes the inference that he has finally managed to wound his adversary. But this inference proves to be false: the blood was already on the spear, and the impact simply spattered it onto Cynus's body. I believe that Ovid's purpose here is to suggest that Agenor might have made a similarly mistaken inference in *Iliad* 21.

When we think back on the *Iliad* in the light of Ovid's suggestion, it becomes clear that Agenor did not have a particularly good view of Achilles's alleged wound. He was with the Trojan forces, and so at least the distance of a spear-cast away. He was no better able to judge the grazing wound that Asteropaeus is said to have inflicted on Achilles than Ovid's Achilles was able to judge the effects of his blow on Cynus. If the Iliadic Achilles was in fact invulnerable, then when the spear of Asteropaeus hit a glancing blow to his arm, there would have been impact, but no penetration. If that spear already had someone else's blood on it, Achilles's arm would have been spattered with that gore and, just like Cynus's, would have appeared to be wounded. What Ovid is saying here is that just because a warrior has been "stained with blood" ("signatum sanguine"), it does not mean that he has been wounded.

In the incident where Homer claims that Achilles has been wounded, there is no call for a doctor, no treatment is administered, and no one actually sees the alleged wound from close quarters. There is only a momentary spattering of blood. This is unusual: Homer normally dwells on the path of the weapon through the body. For example, we may compare another arm wound received by a Greek hero. In *Iliad* 11 Agamemnon is stabbed with a spear, the point goes right through his arm, and blood flows continuously until it stops (11.252–68). Agamemnon then leaves the battlefield to recuperate. There are many examples of more serious wounding in the *Iliad*, such as when a Trojan spear pierces

the side of Odysseus later in that same book (11.435–45). When a major Homeric warrior is wounded, we generally see the weapon penetrate the flesh; blood often flows for some period, and the warrior retires to recuperate. Sometimes there is a lengthy type scene, with an elaborate call for medical attention, as when Menelaus is wounded by the arrow of Pandarus in book 4 (4.127–219). The glancing blow suffered by Achilles is unusual in all of these respects. We are not given a description of the weapon penetrating the flesh. Achilles is not affected in the slightest by his “wound,” but carries on fighting as though nothing has happened. The spurting of the blood is described as a momentary phenomenon, not something that starts, flows, and then stops.

Viewed from the perspective of modern, sympathetic readers of Homer, there is nothing odd about these aspects of the *Iliad*: some injuries are more serious than others, and the fact that Achilles is never wounded as badly as many of the other Greeks is an aspect of his superlative excellence as a warrior. But reading this passage with Ovid, in a hypersuspicious manner, looking at it as “proof” that Achilles was not invulnerable, it becomes highly dubious. The spear of Asteropaeus does not penetrate the skin, so it might well have bounced off Achilles’s arm. The blood does not flow but only spurts, so it might have been spattered there by the impact, just as Menoetes’s blood is spattered onto Cycnus. The verb Homer uses of the motion of the blood (σεύω, 21.167) implies rapidity but does not specify an outward direction; in principle, Homer’s words could refer to blood spattering onto the arm rather than out of it. It is quite possible that Ovid is reflecting Hellenistic discussions of this passage. If it is true, as most suppose, that the story of Thetis dipping Achilles in the Styx goes back to a Hellenistic source, then someone must already have objected immediately that in the *Iliad* Achilles was wounded not in the ankle but in the arm. Ovid may well be intervening in a pre-existing Greek debate about the compatibility of the story of Achilles’s heel with the *Iliad*.²⁵

Ovid argues that there are many ways for a warrior to get blood on his body in the midst of a battle without being wounded. He also shows how a warrior on the other side might mistake a spattering of blood for a genuine wound: for just a moment, when Achilles sees Menoetes’s blood on Cycnus, he is misled into thinking that he has wounded an invulnerable warrior. We do not specifically know whether Asteropaeus in the *Iliad* had the gore of some other unmentioned Greek on his spear when he encountered Achilles, but it is not at all improbable. If we postulate an invulnerable Achilles, then the “grazing” blow struck by Asteropaeus on Achilles’s arm may well have been a more

solid hit—solid enough to send blood spattering onto his arm and give the appearance of blood “spurting” out. That was the interpretation of the distant Agenor. But what of the omniscient narrator, Homer? He vouches for the existence of the wound and the spurting of blood, but perhaps his view was also somewhat distant, both in space and in time. Inspired by no divine Muse, he has no material to go on but soldiers’ self-serving stories and their strategic silences. Moreover, it is in the interest of his own narrative to make Achilles seem as heroic as possible.

For Ovid, Homer has no solid basis for the information he relates about the war other than traditions that go back to the soldiers’ self-serving tales about their own exploits. Achilles is dissimulating his invulnerability in the *Metamorphoses*, so the deception goes back to him. Once we see that Achilles is withholding the truth, it does not really matter whether Homer was consciously complicit in that deception. By removing the Muses from the equation, Ovid subverts Homer, not by attacking his good faith but by undermining the reliability of his sources. Agenor’s mistaken inference is a perfect illustration of the workings of Fama. He sees an event from a distance and mistakenly spreads the story that Achilles is vulnerable. Homer then repeats it, appearing to offer substantiation. Homer is nothing more than the conduit for this unreliable information. Ovid does not need to accuse Homer of complicit and conscious dissimulation in presenting the consequences of Asteropaeus’s spear-throw as if it were a wound. It fits better with the role of Fama in this book of the *Metamorphoses* to see Homer as a mere conduit of battlefield rumor and surmise, having no more authoritative perspective on events than Agenor. In the final analysis it is a more devastating critique of the epic tradition to paint Homer as fundamentally gullible than as selectively mendacious.

Once we understand how Ovid has cast doubt upon the information that had seemed to us, like Agenor, to guarantee the vulnerability of the Homeric Achilles, we are invited by Ovid to reread the *Iliad* in the light of this new information, and this repetition is one of the great pleasures of the Cynus episode. We can revisit all of the heroic deeds of Achilles in Homer and view them as the acts of a lying coward. He seems in the *Iliad* to face his own onrushing death unblinkingly, but now we see that he had an ace up his sleeve in this confrontation with his fate; he knows that he is unlikely to die—especially if he keeps his secret hidden. He has a secret weapon against all of his foes, which means that he can take chances that other heroes cannot. That is not bravery; it is cheating.

Ovid gives us a particularly specific invitation to revisit one special scene of the *Iliad* and re-examine it in this new light. Cyncus boasts that he has no real need to wear armor; for him it is purely decorative, as it is for Mars (*Met.* 12.88–91).²⁶ He says that he could, hypothetically, quite safely go into battle unarmed (12.91–92). This should put us in mind of a famous occasion when Achilles almost does just that. At the start of book 18 of the *Iliad*, Achilles finds out that Patroclus has been killed and that there is a fight ongoing over his corpse. His mother, Thetis, arrives and tells him not to go into battle until she has been able to procure new armor for him. In the normal interpretation of Homer, this shows sensible maternal concern. If we reread it in the new light that Ovid suggests, Thetis seems ridiculous. Either she is overly solicitous about Achilles's welfare, demanding that he put on a largely superfluous layer of protection, or what she is really concerned about is keeping Achilles's invulnerability secret from both his allies and his enemies. After Thetis leaves, Hera sends Iris to rouse Achilles into battle. He objects that he has no available armor and that his mother told him not to venture out until she returns. Under Ovid's suggested reading, this looks like cowardice rather than prudence. Iris finally persuades Achilles just to show himself. With the assistance of Athena, who puts her aegis around him, Achilles stands on the Greek wall and shouts loudly enough to terrify the onrushing Trojans. Ovid transforms this from a scene of unique valor and glory into a pantomime of reluctant and half-hearted commitment. Achilles refrains from entering into battle alongside his comrades when, as we now know, he could have done so without danger. He values the concealment of his secret more than he does the body of his friend Patroclus.

One could reread the entire *Iliad* in this way. The great ecphrasis of Achilles's shield becomes a digression on an irrelevant object, a Homeric red herring. Achilles's confidence in his own superiority as a warrior among the Greek forces begins to seem less like hard-earned self-confidence and more like smug entitlement. On this new reading, the real shame lies in the way Achilles keeps his invulnerability a secret and the way Homer, his spin-doctor, conspires with him, either knowingly or not, to keep this from coming to light. There is no shame in the heroic world in having a supernatural advantage; after all, the Homeric Achilles has no qualms about calling upon his immortal mother for special help that is not available to others. Boasting of one's advantages is the norm on the Homeric battlefield. The shame for a hero lies in hiding an advantage and operating by subterfuge.

Having finished our fun in rereading the *Iliad* in this subversive way, we can turn back to rereading Ovid's account of the encounter with Cyncus in

the same manner. When Cynus identifies himself as invulnerable and offers Achilles the chance to attack him without armor, we see that the natural thing for Achilles to do would be to reciprocate. But in contrast to Cynus, he says nothing. Achilles's repeated efforts to injure Cynus with a spear now make him look a bit slow on the uptake. When he finally begins to pummel Cynus and then strangles him, we no longer imagine that this is an improvisation; we now understand that Achilles will have had cause to wonder in the past about how an invulnerable warrior might meet his death. But it is in the aftermath of the battle that Achilles's silence becomes truly damning. The Greeks eagerly await the discourse of the great hero, and the passage quoted above—where Achilles and the Greeks are united in their amazement at Cynus's invulnerability (*Met.* 12.164–68)—is an engraved invitation for Achilles to speak about his own secret. He spurns it and instead encourages Nestor to speak about the invulnerable Caeneus.

The silence of Achilles becomes most pointedly shameful right after his defeat of Cynus, and this permits us to re-evaluate their battle. The off-hand way in which Cynus discusses his invulnerability stands in stark contrast to Achilles's silence. We are now finally in a position to understand how Ovid can undermine Homeric narrative in a scene in which the quintessential Homeric hero is victorious. Achilles conquers his mirror image, but in the process he reveals himself to be a lesser hero than his defeated rival. Despite his rather foppish and unmacho bearing, Cynus is at least honest about his advantage. In the *Iliad*, Achilles famously says to Odysseus that he hates like the gates of Hades the man who hides one thing in his mind and says a different thing aloud (*Il.* 9.312–13). Yet this is precisely what he becomes in Ovid's revisionist portrait. Achilles may kill Cynus, but he does so in a way that exposes himself as the less honorable hero of the two invulnerable heroes.

We might further interpret Achilles's silence as an indication that it was he, not Ulysses, who was the cleverest of the Greeks at Troy. Invulnerability to sharp weapons was only an advantage if it was kept a secret; otherwise, opponents would simply resort to other instruments of attack. This was the stupidity of Cynus, who boasted openly of his advantage, believing it put him beyond harm. Achilles emerges as the shrewdest of the Greeks, not in what he said, but in what he left unsaid. In this regard he is superior to Ulysses, whose fatal flaw is that he cannot resist boasting about his own cleverness. In the canonical epic tradition and in *Metamorphoses* 13, Ajax represents unsophisticated, raw strength, whereas Ulysses represents intelligence and guile. Paradoxically, in *Metamorphoses* 12 the apparently effeminate Cynus actually

represents plainspoken Iliadic might, whereas the apparently brutal Achilles actually represents Odyssean dissimulation and subterfuge.

Moreover, Ovid exposes Homer's complicity in keeping Achilles's shameful secret. We see now that the Cynus episode is of a piece with the rest of Ovid's Trojan War narrative in dismantling the claims to objectivity and reliability made by Homer and the rest of the canonical epic tradition. The garulous tendentiousness of the narratives of Nestor, Ajax, and Ulysses in books 12 and 13 is mirrored in the silence of Achilles about his invulnerability. Just as Nestor can omit Hercules from the story of the Lapiths and Centaurs if it suits him, so too Achilles is free to create a selectively narcissistic portrait of his own deeds. The only constraint on him is the presence of witnesses who might contradict his version of events, just as Hercules's son Tlepolemus does to Nestor. But Achilles does not need to do much lying; he only needs to stay silent and refuse to do anything that might betray his secret, such as venturing into the battle over Patroclus's corpse without armor. As long as Achilles kept his counsel, the natural assumption that he was vulnerable kept its hold. Thus, when he was spattered with blood, as was inevitable for a warrior on a battlefield, bystanders such as Agenor were free to assume that he had been wounded, and Homer was happy to play along. Whether Homer was in on the secret or not makes little difference to his reliability. Ovid is not looking to contradict Homer directly or to supplant his version of events; he is trying to undermine the reader's confidence in any self-professedly objective epic narrative. In this, Ovid's ultimate target is not so much Homer, but Vergil.

THE OVIDIAN *Achilleid*

We began our discussion of Ovid's Cynus episode by bringing to bear evidence from Statius's *Achilleid* to show that a Roman audience somewhat later than Ovid could be expected by an epic poet to be perfectly familiar with the story of Achilles's heel. We now turn the tables to look briefly at what this common link with Ovid's epic might mean for Statius. The main thrust of scholarly opinion on Statius's second epic poem, the incomplete *Achilleid*, is that it is self-consciously Ovidian and thus marked a deliberate change from the style of his first epic.²⁷ The *Thebaid* deals with the dark subject matter of civil war and ends by paying explicit homage to Vergil, in whose footsteps the author bids his poem to follow. Having thus ended an epic poem with a gesture toward restoring Vergil to his central position in the Latin epic tradition, a position Ovid and Lucan had done their best to undermine, it is startling to find Statius's next epic taking the anti-Vergilian *Metamorphoses* as its generic

model.²⁸ This surprise has been too much for a minority of critics, who are reluctant to see an epic by the ultra-Vergilian Statius on the ultra-Homeric topic of Achilles as being anything other than an orthodox version of the canonical Trojan tradition. The problem is that this stance involves dismissing the existing narrative, which centers on Achilles's cross-dressed stay on Scyros, as a nonessential, digressive prelude. The continuing resistance to recognizing the programmatically Ovidian aspects of Statius's second epic can be demonstrated by a recent restatement of that position by Alan Cameron (2009). Cameron's view is that once Statius decided to write an epic on the life of Achilles, he was obliged to include the Scyros episode, and it was natural to treat such a romantic episode in an Ovidian fashion. In other words, the Ovidianness of much of the existing *Achilleid* is acknowledged to be real, but held to be incidental and not important. This paint-by-numbers view of poetic composition is not very attractive and does not lend itself to nuanced interpretation. The features of the Homeric Achilles that Cameron identifies in the *Achilleid* are indeed present; but so too is the Ovidian Achilles. To dismiss either side of the poem is to destroy its central tension. The partially completed epic ends by leaving the reader in a state of generic aporia, wanting to know how Statius will manage to sustain the tension between the Homeric and Ovidian sides of the story once we get to Troy.

A close examination of Cameron's strategy for reconstructing the future course of the epic, based upon his certainty that Statius would never dare to contradict Homer, will in fact reveal aspects of the *Achilleid* that are fundamentally and irrevocably at odds with Homer. The two brief mentions of Scyros in the *Iliad* are crucial evidence for any project of reconciling Statius and Homer. In book 19, Achilles bemoans the fact that he does not even know if his son, Neoptolemus, who is being raised for him on Scyros, is still alive (19.326–27). That detail harmonizes perfectly with Statius's Scyros narrative, for Achilles leaves his son there to be raised by Deidamia. The other Homeric passage is problematic, however: it is an off-hand reference to a slave girl Achilles took as booty when he sacked Scyros (9.667–68). The existence of a story about Achilles taking Scyros by force sits uneasily with the version whereby he hid there as a guest, disguised as a girl. Many narratives, ancient and modern, have therefore postulated that Achilles visited Scyros twice, once in disguise and once as a besieger (see Heslin 2005, 202–5). Such a possibility is hinted at by Ovid himself: his Ulysses discusses how he revealed Achilles when he was hiding in female clothing (*Met.* 13.162–70, though he does not mention the name of Scyros), and five lines later alludes to Achilles as having captured

Scyros by force (“Scyrum cepisse,” 13.175). If Statius did go on to describe Achilles as returning to Scyros to sack it, it is not the case that this would necessarily mark a turn away from Ovid and toward Homer, as Cameron claims; both episodes are already present cheek by jowl in the *Metamorphoses*.

Cameron is confident that Statius’s Achilles would return to Scyros in an utterly savage mood (2009, 21):

But Statius was evidently happy to accept and even embellish the implications of [*Iliad*] 9.668, because it allowed him to develop a much darker and more complex version of the Scyros story. Apparently he was planning to have Achilles return from Troy to Scyros on one of those expeditions in search of booty we learn of from Homer, to destroy the scene of his discreditable sojourn “among the girls.” Deidameia herself was to die in the carnage (not necessarily by Achilles’ own hand). To dwell on the idyllic and sentimental aspects of book 1 is to ignore the way Statius himself undermines what might have seemed the most carefree period of the young hero’s life.

The basis for this reconstruction is a passage in the *Achilleid* that Cameron mischaracterizes as a “prophecy” of a coming day when Scyros will be sacked and Deidamia will be killed. If we look at that passage in detail, it is clearly part of an adynaton. That is to say, it is precisely the opposite of a prophecy. Achilles has just raped Deidamia and is revealing to her his true identity. He tells her that she should not weep or be afraid, for she has been joined to his great and powerful family. Then one of them brings up the prospect of the disapproval of her father, Lycomedes, in an eloquent aposiopesis (*Achil.* 1.657–60):²⁹

sed pater—ante igni ferroque excisa iacebit
 Scyros et in tumidas ibunt haec versa procellas
 moenia, quam saevo mea tu conubia pendas
 funere: non adeo parebimus omnia matri.

As for your father—Scyros shall lie razed by fire and sword and these walls be overturned and pass into swollen tempests before you shall expiate my nuptials by a cruel death. Not so in all things shall I obey my mother.

So Achilles is saying that Scyros will lie in ruins before Deidamia will ever pay with her life for her union with Achilles. He is not saying that either of these things is likely to happen—quite the opposite. If her father tries to harm her,

Achilles will defy his mother's orders to stay in disguise and will take up arms to protect her and repel him and all of the forces of Scyros. In other words, Deidamia will not die at the hands of her father, because before that could happen, Achilles himself would destroy and depopulate the island. But both syntax and sense indicate that this is not a prophecy of an actual event.³⁰ As it turns out later in the poem, a surprised Lycomedes accepts Achilles as his son-in-law. The king is elderly and has no male children or grandchildren other than the infant Neoptolemus (*Achil.* 1.775–83), so Achilles's son is heir to the kingdom of Scyros. If Achilles were to return to sack the island at some later point, he would be stealing the possessions of his own son, and bringing violence not only against his former lover, but also Neoptolemus himself, whom he speaks of wistfully in the *Iliad*. The friendly terms on which Achilles departs from Lycomedes and Deidamia in Statius's version make such a savage return rather unlikely, or at best a scene ripe for extreme paradox. On the other hand, Cameron is of course right that Achilles's hypothetical vision of himself sacking and depopulating Scyros to protect Deidamia is an allusion to the Homeric version where Achilles sacked Scyros and enslaved its people. This is an example of the Alexandrian technique whereby a poet alludes to the existence of an alternative mythical tradition at the very moment when he rules it out and chooses to follow a different version.

Cameron concludes his rejection of the *Metamorphoses* as a primary model for the *Achilleid* thus (2009, 22):

Even in Book 1, the sentimental tone and lightness of touch that modern readers find so attractive is intermittent, repeatedly undercut by darker hints of the Trojan tragedy that will follow. It is less the first chapter in a life of Achilles than an account of how he came to participate in the Trojan War.

...

It is no doubt idle to debate the tone of 10,000 odd lines that were never written, and Statius might well have failed to achieve a satisfactory balance even if he had lived to complete his poem. . . . But for all the charm and wit of Book 1, overall I see no reason to believe that it was the *Metamorphoses* rather than the *Iliad* or *Aeneid* that he was hoping to rival—as indeed the evocation of Homer in the proem implies.

The first thing to note is that Cameron equates the lighter aspects of the *Achilleid* with Ovid and then draws the inference that its darker aspects are by necessity Homeric. But few modern readers of the *Metamorphoses* would

view it as a lighthearted collection of happy love affairs. The darkest and most violent moments in the existing *Achilleid*, such as Achilles's rape of Deidamia, are its most intensely Ovidian; and the influence of the *Metamorphoses* is ubiquitous in the grim *Thebaid*.³¹ The "grisly ends" met by the other women in Achilles's life are not antithetical to the spirit of the *Metamorphoses* but perfectly congruent with it (Cameron 2009, 21). Since Cameron points to the opening lines of the *Achilleid* as being programmatically Homeric, it may be useful to look at them here (*Achil.* 1.1–7):

Magnanimum Aeaciden formidatamque Tonanti
progeniem et patrio vetitam succedere caelo,
diva, refer. quamquam acta viri multum incluta cantu
Maeonio (sed plura vacant), nos ire per omnem
(sic amor est) heroa velis Scyroque latentem
Dulichia proferre tuba nec in Hectore tracto
sistere, sed tota iuvenem deducere Troia.

Goddess, tell of great-hearted Aeacides and offspring feared of the Thunderer and forbidden to succeed to his father's heaven. The hero's deeds, 'tis true, are much famed in Maeonian song, but more are yet to celebrate. Be it your pleasure that I (so I crave) traverse the whole hero, bringing him forth by Dulichian trump as he hides in Scyros, not stopping at Hector's drag, but singing the warrior through Troy's whole story.

Cameron argues that the first word of the epic is particularly indicative of its affiliation with the canonical epic tradition (Cameron 2009, 20, citing Parkes 2008, 382). It certainly sounds strikingly like a Homeric/Vergilian epithet, but closer examination reveals another side to it (Heslin 2005, 71, with n. 38). In book 13 of the *Metamorphoses*, Ulysses narrates his successful unveiling of Achilles from his girlish disguise as one of the reasons why he should be awarded the arms of the dead hero (*Met.* 13.162–70). A bit later in this speech, when rebutting Ajax's charge that he was a coward for having hidden himself from the war, he reminds the audience that the "great-hearted" Achilles had done precisely the same thing on Scyros ("magnanimo . . . Achilli," 13.299). So in the context of Statius's proem, which explicitly mentions Ulysses's unveiling of Achilles on Scyros, the epithet *magnanimum* is both Homeric and Ovidian simultaneously; from the first word of the epic, Statius keeps his narrative poised between the two alternatives.

As he moves on, Statius alludes to the story that Jupiter forced Thetis to marry Peleus for fear of his own position, a story that is non-Homeric. In the *Iliad*, Hera claims that it was she who arranged the marriage (*Il.* 24.59–62), though there are hints of the other story in the background (see Slatkin 1992). Statius then mentions Homer explicitly (“cantu / Maeonio”), but does so to highlight his own intention to engage with those episodes that have not already been dealt with in the existing tradition (“plura vacant”). This is a rather Ovidian strategy, and when applied to the life of Achilles, we might think especially of the Cynus episode. Statius then provides two examples of the stories he will include. One is lighthearted and explicitly Ovidian and non-Homeric: the discovery of Achilles on Scyros by Ulysses using the ruse of the trumpet (cf. *Met.* 13.162–70). The other is tragic and quintessentially Homeric and non-Ovidian: the dragging of Hector's body (glossed over by Ovid in one line of his Trojan narrative, *Met.* 12.591). Statius concludes his proem by emphasizing his intention to be fully inclusive in his handling of Achilles's life and his part in the Trojan War (“omnem . . . heroa” and “tota . . . Troia”). Given this careful balance of allusions to Ovid and Homer, and its emphasis on a comprehensive narrative, it is clearly a mistake to read the proem as promising a narrowly canonical treatment. The proem of the *Achilleid* alludes programmatically to both the *Iliad* and the *Metamorphoses* as potential models. The fact that these models would seem to be so fundamentally incompatible is part of its teasing appeal.

The centrality of Achilles in Roman culture as a paradigm of virtue is precisely what made him attractive as a potential target for mischievous humor. The later Roman pictorial cycles depicting the early life and education of Achilles that are excellently discussed by Cameron may well have been influenced by Statius's narrative without necessarily partaking of its Ovidian spirit. One can certainly choose to read the *Achilleid* “straight,” as one can also do for books 12 and 13 of the *Metamorphoses*. But Statius, like Ovid, also makes room for a reading that subverts Achilles's heroism. At this point, we can apply to the *Achilleid* what we have learned about Ovid's irreverent treatment of Achilles's life in book 12 of the *Metamorphoses*.

We can now see that the Scyros episode is not the only part of the *Achilleid* that looks to Ovid rather than Homer. In the light of Ovid's allusion to the invulnerability of Achilles in the *Metamorphoses*, Statius's repeated allusion to the dipping of Achilles in the Styx begins to look more like a programmatic statement of intent than a mere chronological curiosity. It is self-evident that Thetis's efforts to make her son immortal are a non-Homeric element included

by Statius, but we can now see that this is a squarely anti-Homeric aspect of the narrative, insofar as a partially invulnerable Achilles would inevitably tend to undermine the seriousness of his heroism. Most speculation about the potential future trajectory of the *Achilleid* tends to assume that non-Homeric erotic episodes would be mixed with traditionally Homeric battle scenes in some proportion or other (see Heslin 2005, 83–86). But if the allusions to the dipping in the Styx are also allusions to Ovid and to the link between Achilles and Cynus, then we can contemplate the possibility that the battle scenes could, potentially, owe as much to Ovid's essentially unserious Cynus episode as to the *Iliad*. It is, at least, one of the many narrative possibilities that Statius teases us with.

Ovid's striking juxtaposition of Achilles with the theme of invulnerability can help us to understand better the character of Statius's repeated, overt allusions to that hero's partial invulnerability. It is well known that the first reference in literature or art to the myth of the dipping in the Styx and to Achilles's vulnerable heel comes in the *Achilleid*.³² Since it is an unattested myth, it is striking that Statius mentions the story not once but three times, growing slightly less oblique each time. The first instance is a very obscure reference by Thetis to her nightmares in which she seems to return to submerge Achilles in the Styx again (*Achil.* 1.133–34): “saepe ipsa—nefas!—sub inania natum / Tartara et ad Stygios iterum fero mergere fontes” (“often I myself—oh horror!—am bearing my son down to hollow Tartarus, bearing him to dip again in the waters of the Styx”). There is a clever joke here. Thetis recoils in horror at her dreaming repetition of the trip to the Styx, but the presence of the word “again” (*iterum*) might make one wonder. Having failed to submerge Achilles totally in her first attempt, why did she not return to the Styx at some later point to finish the job, dipping only his heel? Already in this first, casual reference to the myth, Statius is not just alluding to it; he is joking about it. If Statius had left it at that, we might excuse Thetis by postulating that at this point she did not know that her protection had been incomplete. But that recourse is eliminated in Thetis's next reference to her deed (*Achil.* 1.269–70): “si progenitum Stygos amne severo / armavi (totumque utinam)” (“if I armed you at birth with the stern Stygian river [and would that it had been all of you]”). This makes two things clear: she already knows that Achilles has a vulnerable point, and Achilles himself, to whom she is speaking here, has always known about his partial invulnerability. We must now conclude that Thetis has become aware of the flaw in Achilles's protection too late in her child's life for the magic to work a second time.³³ At this point, we might

imagine that Statius intends to follow Ovid closely, with the invulnerability kept a closely held family secret between Achilles, Thetis, and Chiron. In Troy Achilles would keep silent about it and would let the world assume that he is normal, as in Homer and Ovid. But the third and final allusion to the myth is different in character. At this point in the epic, we have left Thetis and have shifted the scene to Aulis, where the Greek fleet is clamoring for Achilles to join them. The crowd demands his presence, enumerating his many special qualities, culminating in the most explicit allusion to Achilles's invulnerability (*Achil.* 1.480–82):

quemve alium Stygios tulerit secreta per amnes
Nereis et pulchros ferro praestruxerit artus?
haec Graiae castris iterant traduntque cohortes.

Whom else did a Nereid take through Styx' river in secret and block his fair limbs against steel? Such talk do the Greek cohorts in their camp repeat and pass on.

The Greeks allude to the fact that the story used to be a secret (*secreta*), but it certainly is not any more. This is a vital point. Up to now, it has seemed that the references to the invulnerability of Achilles, like the inclusion of the cross-dressing episode, must belong to a non-Homeric, Ovidian, even anti-Homeric tradition. But it turns out that Statius is not intending to follow Ovid in treating the invulnerability as a family secret. Statius's Achilles will be neither Homeric nor Ovidian, but an independent creation, though indebted to those two predecessors. Unlike Homer's Achilles, Statius's will be invulnerable; unlike Ovid's, he will not lie about it like a coward. It is interesting to think about how this would play out on the battlefield at Troy. Perhaps Statius was intending to have Achilles and Cynus meet as equals, with their mutual invulnerability a matter of public record and acknowledged by both. It seems that Statius's Achilles may keep one secret, however: the Greek crowd does not necessarily know about his vulnerable heel. This suggests an interesting narrative pathway at Troy in which the Greeks and Trojans think that Achilles is more invincible than he knows himself to be.

One final peculiarity of Statius's deployment of the myth of Achilles's partial invulnerability is that he refers to it overtly yet obliquely in a manner that leaves the reader who does not know the myth completely flummoxed. For example, he never specifies the heel as Achilles's vulnerable point. How can

he assume this background knowledge on the part of his readers when this is the first overt attestation of the myth? The usual theory, which is owed to Carl Robert, is that Statius found the story in a now-lost Hellenistic source; and this is likely to be correct (see Burgess 1995; Heslin 2005, 166–69). Statius very frequently alludes to Alexandrian writers, and his father taught some of them, including the most obscure, in the advanced syllabus of his school.³⁴ But Statius refrains from inserting Alexandrian references into the text in such a way as to make it unintelligible to the uninitiated. These allusions usually provide extra pleasure to those who see them, but the reader who does not can still understand the text. For comparison, this is precisely how Ovid's allusions to the invulnerability of Achilles function in book 12 of the *Metamorphoses*. It is perfectly possible to understand Ovid's text without them. The reader who does have this knowledge has, as I hope to have shown, access to more profound pleasure and understanding, but Ovid does not make it a prerequisite. Something changes in the century between Ovid and Statius, and the latter simply takes for granted that all of his readers, not just a select few with good access to Hellenistic literature, will know the story.

The most obvious candidate for what has changed in the interim is the dissemination of the *Metamorphoses* itself. I think the reason that Statius can be sure his Latin-speaking audience will be aware of this previously unattested Greek myth is its use by Ovid, as argued here. In other words, Ovid did not assume that all of his readers would know the story of the dipping of Achilles in the Styx, but as an informal exegetical tradition grew up around Ovid's epic, the knowledge was passed from reader to reader. After a hundred years of Romans discussing and sharing Ovid's delicate allusion to some lost passage of Hellenistic literature that promulgated the obscure myth of Achilles's heel, and in the light of the subtle pleasures this allusion afforded the reader of the *Metamorphoses*, Statius could be confident that his audience of devotees of Latin epic would know what he was talking about. He could thus deploy references to the myth in a much less surreptitious fashion.

Ovid set out in the *Metamorphoses* to undermine the authority of canonical epic by inviting the reader to repeat Homer's narrative in the light of subversive, supplementary knowledge about the invulnerability of Achilles. Two thousand years later, the story of Achilles's heel and his partial invulnerability is the only part of the hero's biography that is common knowledge among the general public. What Ovid set out to do to Homer by means of repetition has been accomplished by oblivion. Nevertheless, in the contest to define the character of Achilles, in the long run Ovid won.

NOTES

1. So runs the now-traditional misquotation of the most famous line from the 1980 film *The Empire Strikes Back*, where we learn that the antagonists of the preceding *Star Wars* are father and son. Of course, this is a very different situation from the relationship between Homer and Ovid. The *Star Wars* films were really more like slowly revealed acts of a unified drama than true cinematic sequels and prequels, which are usually improvisations by different authors. Better science fiction analogies could be drawn from mythical worlds with a long and unplanned evolution, such as *Doctor Who* or *Star Trek*, though Ovid's attitude to Homer is far from that of the custodian of a beloved and lucrative tradition.

2. On the pace of Ovid's Trojan narrative, see Musgrove 1998, 224.

3. Pind. *Ol.* 2.81–83; *Isthm.* 5.39–41. Willcock (1995, on the former passage) points out that Pindar groups together Cynus, Memnon, and Hector, as they are Achilles's first, last, and greatest victims, respectively.

4. Dictys of Crete (2.1–12) has Protesilaus killed by Aeneas and says that the attack of Cynus happened during his funeral.

5. *Alex.* 232–33. Tzetzes (ad loc.) prefers the version where he is struck by a stone in the head and infers that because Achilles happened to kill Cynus in this manner, the story grew up that Cynus was invulnerable except for his head. But the invulnerability enjoyed by figures like Cynus and Caeneus was to cutting weapons; they are never unkillable by other means. There is no need to posit a vulnerable point for Cynus.

6. For detailed discussion of the fragments, see Sommerstein and Talboy 2012, 174–215. See also *POxy.* 2256, fr. 3, line 7, which may preserve some letters of the name of this play adjacent to what may be the name *Cynus*; cf. Rosen 2003, n7; Sommerstein and Talboy 2012, 188.

7. For a negative evaluation of Rosen's thesis, see Sommerstein and Talboy 2012, 183–88. Rosen (2003, n25) also makes an intriguing connection between one of the fragments and Juvenal's mock-epic turbot, though he presumes that the similarity is coincidental. But there is no implausibility in both Ovid and Juvenal knowing this Sophoclean play.

8. Theoc. *Id.* 16.49: $\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \chi\rho\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \text{Κύκνον}$, on which see Möller 2003, 53.

9. *FGH* 4F148; see also Hesiod *F* 237 M-W with Gantz 1993, 594, which suggests that Cynus may have been envisioned as an albino.

10. Ath. 9.393e, where, however, the transformation is effected by Ares rather than Poseidon, so it is not entirely sure that this is the same Cynus; Ovid tells of several. See Möller 2003, 54; Reed 2013, 389. On Macer, see Hollis 2007, 93–117, especially *F* 53.

11. Papaioannou 2007, 50–86, with further bibliography; quotation on 71–72.

12. On the awkwardness of reading Cynus purely as an allegory for Ovidian poetics, see Ziogas 2008.

13. The text and translation of the *Metamorphoses* used throughout are from Hill 1999. For a detailed discussion of how the gaps in Nestor's memory undermine his own authority and thereby discredit more generally the device of the first-person flashback as used in canonical epic, see the excellent Musgrove 1998. My approach extends Musgrove's: I think Ovid undermines here the authority not only of first-person epic narrative, but of the entire epic tradition.

14. Musgrove 1998, 227: "Nestor has already listed so many other wounds in such detail that it seems implausible that in only this one case his memory would fail him."

15. Text: Diggle 1984; translation: Davie 1998. Even if Euripides is thinking here as much of Aeschylus as of Homer, and is speaking to an audience familiar with massed hoplite warfare, the basic point still stands.

16. As Musgrove (1998, 227) notes, Nestor's appeal to Peleus as a witness (*Met.* 12.440) is hollow, as Peleus is far away.

17. Musgrove (1998, 228) reads the disagreement between Hercules's version of the story and the received tradition as undermining all mythical objectivity, but she stops there.

18. See the comments of Reed (2013, 436–37) on Nestor's editorial intervention as a sort of *damnatio memoriae* of Hercules. On Nestor's bias, see Ziogas 2013, 206–18; on the power of his silence, see Fratantuono 2011, 356.

19. This is the point of the lines in which Ovid says that the Greek heroes spurned musical entertainment with the lyre and preferred instead to talk about their own deeds, thus rendering the Homeric moment deliberately banal (*Met.* 12.157–62).

20. On Nestor's Caeneus tale, see Ziogas 2013, 180–205; on other aspects of Cynus as an "alter Achilles," see Papaioannou 2007, 50–79.

21. Text: Allen 1931; translation: adapted from Murray and Wyatt 1999.

22. Thus Richardson 1993, ad 21.568–70: "There is never any allusion in Homer to the later legend of Akhilleus' invulnerability." Also Papaioannou 2007, 64: "In the *Iliad* Homer clearly portrays the hero as vulnerable." On the fundamentally anti-Homeric and quintessentially cyclic nature of the theme of invulnerability, see Griffin 1977, 40.

23. On the irony of including Telephus in this list, see Papaioannou 2007, 77–79.

24. Menoetes may be named after a low-status character in book 5 of the *Aeneid* who serves a similarly comical, slapstick purpose (5.159–82). Another figure by the same name in *Aeneid* 12 is also poor and of low status (12.516–20). See Fratantuono 2011, 340–41; for a different view, see Papaioannou 2007, 76–77.

25. There may be one distant echo of that lost Greek tradition. One of the distinctive features of Asteropaeus is that he is ambidextrous. John Tzetzes (ad Lycoph. *Alex.* 232) seems to know a tradition where Cynus is also an ambidextrous fighter (περιδέξιος, same word used). Perhaps it is a coincidence, or perhaps an echo of the same connection made in one of Ovid's sources. The humorous Ovidian neologism for "vulnerable" (*forabilis*, *Met.* 12.170) may have been inspired by discussion of the Homeric *hapax* τρωτὸς.

26. Ziogas 2008 makes the interesting point that Cynus is mistaken here, for Ares is indeed wounded in the *Iliad*.

27. A position formulated most strongly by Hinds 1998; see also the bibliography cited in Feeney 2004, 85n2, to which add Heslin 2005; P. Davis 2006; Parkes 2008; Uccellini 2012, xv–xxi.

28. The *Thebiad* had in fact been just as much a generic surprise. The Seven against Thebes had become the quintessential subject of bad, bombastic, anti-Callimachean poetry, as exemplified by Propertius's caricature of "Ponticus": see Heslin 2011, 52–55. Statius's rehabilitation of this despised epic theme was modeled upon Vergil's smaller-scale rehabilitation of cyclic epic themes in books 2 and 3 of the *Aeneid*.

29. Text and translation of the *Achilleid* are taken from Shackleton Bailey 2003; other translations render the syntax similarly. It does not matter for the purposes of this discussion whether the aposiopesis is an interruption by Deidamia or is "spoken by Achilles as if it were an objection by Deidamia" (Dilke 1954, ad loc.).

30. Cameron omits both the *ante* and the *quam* from his quotations, so it is not clear what alternative he proposes to the usual interpretation of the syntax.

31. On the *Achilleid*, see Heslin 2005, 261–76; on Ovid in the *Thebaid*, see Keith 2004–5.

32. On the mythical tradition, see Burgess 1995; 2009, 8–16.

33. On Statius's characterization of Thetis via her failures to protect her son, see Heslin 2005, 106–37.

34. On the first point, see McNelis 2007; on the second, McNelis 2002.

Loca luminis haurit

Ovid's Recycling of Hecuba

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS

In *Metamorphoses* 13, Ovid recounts the destruction of Troy, Hecuba's bereavement after the deaths of Polyxena and Polydorus, among many others, and finally Polymestor's loss of sight.¹ This triptych of events, prefatory to the *Little Aeneid*, is representative of Ovid's triadic amatory structures in this and subsequent books—for instance, the story of Polyphemus, Galatea, and Acis, or that of Scylla, Glaucus, and Circe. The Hecuba episode, however, plays a more significant role than has been heretofore recognized by critics. In this chapter I examine Hecuba's portrayal and the emphasis placed on empty space (most particularly Polymestor's violent blinding and the heroine's tomb), as well as the Trojan woman's final transformation in the epic narrative. I discuss how Ovid carefully restructures the episode around the problematics of anger (*ira*) and its punitive results, as a recycled Hecuba reenacts the end of the *Aeneid*. I submit that Hecuba's gradual transformation from human into dog is constructed by the poet as an appropriate introduction to his *Little Aeneid*. As Hecuba gives in to the power of blind anger and digs out Polymestor's eyes, the poet allusively calls the reader's attention to the intertextual relation between this passage and the final lines of Vergil's ktistic epic. Hecuba's irate, animalistic disposition foreshadows the end of the Aeneadic part of the poem, while Ovid metapoetically alludes to his own repetition, alteration, and manipulation of the tradition by mining and recasting all previous accounts of Hecuba's death and transformation, and in particular Vergil's narrative.

By applying the term "recycling" to Hecuba, I refer to Ovid's "re-placing" of her onto the map of cyclic epic poetry and memorialization:² Hecuba becomes a signpost in the narrative, an actual *sema*, a tomb, though an empty

one. Since Ovid's grand *opus* in a way encompasses most of the epic cycle's themes, Greek and Roman, Hecuba is repositioned within the framework of the narrative, and as such her presence is by no means redundant or repetitive. But at the same time, it constitutes yet another repetition; and here is how we are invited to understand "recycling" too. First, intertextually, Hecuba's tragedy is adopted and adapted by Ovid from a variety of Greco-Roman sources. As Dan Curley has most recently pointed out, "The guiding principles for composing tragedy in antiquity were repetition and innovation. . . . Repetition and innovation aptly describe the creative dynamic of tragedy."³ As such, Hecuba's story is recycled and repeated by Ovid with a specific innovation in mind: the queen's transformation into a dog has to fit into the framework of the book, and of the *Metamorphoses* in general, in a crucial point in the narrative—namely the aftermath of Troy's destruction and the dawn of Roman history. Second, Hecuba's vengeful anger reflects, repeats, and recycles Procne's by means of the intratextual allusion to the daughter of Pandion: as we shall see, the drama is set in Thrace, and the phrase "poenaeque in imagine tota est" is used for both epic mothers, Procne and Hecuba. Thus, a single line is recycled and transferred from the Athenian mythological tradition to the Trojan cycle, a cycle that prominently features an epicized mother from Greek, Athenian, Euripidean tragedy: that is, Hecuba. Epic and tragedy mingle, generic boundaries are crossed, as Ovid invites us to reflect on the metamorphosis of the Trojan queen, a transformation that results in her death. As Neil Hopkinson (2000, 24) observes, "Ovid puts a tragedy of epic origin back within the framework of epic; this . . . is one more example of the all-inclusiveness of the *Metamorphoses*, a work which on a poetic level provides a fittingly changeful complement for its subject-matter."

HECUBA BEFORE AND AFTER

The conflict between Ajax and Ulysses over the arms of Achilles in the first part of book 13 of the *Metamorphoses* comes to an end after the former's suicide and his ensuing transformation, which etiologically closes an episode often characterized as redundantly rhetorical, a label that has also been a staple of Ovidian criticism with regard to Hecuba's role in the book.⁴ Immediately after the battle over the weapons of the best of the Achaeans, Ovid proceeds to one of the major scenes of his condensed Trojan epic cycle: the sack of Troy (the *Little Iliad*). The fall and destruction of the city of Laomedon together with Hecuba's loss of her children, Polyxena's sacrifice, and the closing

scene of Polymestor's blinding make up a triad of events that can be considered programmatic, preparing the reader for other tripartite stories in this and subsequent books. Despite the claims of many critics in the past who viewed the episode as an unsuccessful rendering or mere repetition of Euripides's account,⁵ this scene is now recognized as having an even more significant role in the book. Ovid's omissions of and expansions on the Homeric and post-Homeric tradition in the last books of the *Metamorphoses* have been interpreted in recent years as characteristic of his poetic intentions. He exploits these repetitions and innovations in his portrayal of Hecuba, who becomes in the poet's hands a medium to announce a refashioning of canonical epic, especially Vergil's *Aeneid*.

Here Hecuba laments the death of her son Hector by expressing a wish to eat Achilles's ἥπαρ in her desire for revenge (ἄντιτα ἔργα) (*Il.* 24.208–16):

νῦν δὲ κλαίωμεν ἀνευθεν
 ἥμενοι ἐν μεγάρῳ· τῷ δ' ὥς ποθι Μοῖρα κραταιή
 γιγνομένῳ ἐπένησε λίνῳ, ὅτε μιν τέκον αὐτή,
 ἀργίποδας κύνας ἄσαι ἐὼν ἀπάνευθε τοκήων
 ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἥπαρ ἔχοιμι
 ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα· τότε ἄντιτα ἔργα γένοιτο
 παιδὸς ἐμοῦ, ἐπεὶ οὐ ἐκακίζομένον γε κατέκτα,
 ἀλλὰ πρὸ Τρώων καὶ Τρωϊάδων βαθυκόλπων
 ἐσταότ' οὔτε φόβου μεμνημένον οὔτ' ἄλεωρῆς.

Let us now make our lament far from him we mourn, staying here in the hall.
 In this way for him did restless Fate spin with her thread at his birth, when I
 myself bore him, that he should glut swift-footed dogs far from his parents, in
 the power of a violent man, in whose inmost heart I wish I could fix my teeth
 and feed on it; then might deeds of requital be done for my son, since in no
 way while playing the coward was he slain by him, but while standing in
 defense of the men and deep-bosomed Trojan women, with no thought of
 shelter or flight.

According to P. M. C. Forbes Irving (1990, 208), her grim desire to eat the liver of her son's murderer vividly suggests "the animal in man (especially in the context of Achilles feeding Hector to the dogs)."

Following the Euripidean and, more vividly, the Hellenistic tradition as attested by Nicander (an obvious source for Ovid's metamorphic plays),⁶

Hecuba's transformation into a dog is precipitated by the destruction of Troy and the death of Priam, calamities that make the queen jump into the sea, as she turns into a hound (Eur. *Hec.* 1265–74):

Πο. κύων γενήσῃ πύρσ' ἔχουσα δέργματα.

Εκ. πῶς δ' οἶσθα μορφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς μετάστασιν;

Πο. ὁ Θρηξι μάντις εἶπε Διόνυσος τάδε.

Εκ. σοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔχρησεν οὐδὲν ὧν ἔχεις κακῶν;

Πο. οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἂν σὺ μ' εἶλες ὥδε σὺν δόλῳ.

Εκ. θανοῦσα δ' ἢ ζῶσ' ἐνθάδ' ἐκπλήσω †βιον†;

Πο. θανοῦσα· τύμβῳ δ' ὄνομα σῶι κεκλήσεται . . .

Εκ. μορφῆς ἐπωιδὸν μή τι τῆς ἐμῆς ἐρεῖς;

Πο. κυνὸς ταλαίνης σῆμα, ναυτίλοις τέκμαρ.

Εκ. οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, σοῦ γέ μοι δόντος δίκην.

Pol. You will become a dog with bloodshot gaze. Hec. How did you know of my transformation? Pol. Dionysus, our Thracian prophet, told me so. Hec. And did he prophesy to you nothing of your present trouble? Pol. No, for you would never have caught me thus by guile. Hec. Dead or alive shall I complete my life here? Pol. Dead; and to your tomb shall be given a name—Hec. Recalling my form, or what will you tell me? Pol. “The hapless hound’s grave,” a mark for mariners. Hec. It is nothing to me, now that you have paid me the penalty.

The play ends with Polymestor’s mysterious vaticination of Hecuba’s approaching wretchedness.⁷ The blind king of Thrace foresees how Hecuba will run up the mast of a ship in the form of a dog with fiery eyes and then disappear into the sea, and how her tomb will be called the κυνὸς σῆμα.⁸ However, in the Euripidean version no reason is given for this transformation. For the outraged king there is an implied psychological causation: transformation into a dog reflects the savagery Hecuba shows in the main part of the play. Euripides makes the blind Polymestor emphasize Hecuba’s πύρσα δέργματα, “fiery eyes,” her death (θανοῦσα), her insistence on vengeance (δίκην), and her *metastasis* into the κυνὸς σῆμα, the marker for sailors on the Thracian coast. One could compare here the anonymous lyric fragment with its emphasis, too, on the transformation and the dog’s eyes (PMG 965):

χαροπὰν κύνᾱ

χάλκεον δέ οἱ γνάθων ἐκ πολιᾶν φθειγγομένης

ὑπάκουε μὲν Ἴδα Τένεδός τε περιρρύτα
Θρηίκιοί τε φίλῃνεμοὶ γύαι.

A dog with blazing eyes and Mt. Ida and sea-girt Tenedos and the windswept rocks of Thrace heard her brazen voice as she let out cries from her aged jaws.
(Trans. Hopkins 2000).⁹

Conversely, Nicander relocates the story back to the city of Troy: the destruction of her *polis*, in addition, of course, to the death of her husband, is the predominant reason for Hecuba's transformation (Nic. *Heteroioumena* fr. 62 Gow-Schofield):

ἐνθ' Ἐκάβη Κισσηίς, ὅτ' ἐν πυρὶ δέρκετο πάτρην
καὶ πόσιν ἔλκηθεῖσα παρασπαίροντα θυηλαῖς,
εἰς ἄλα ποσσὶν ὄρουσε καὶ ἦν ἡλλάξατο μορφὴν
γρήιον, Ἵρκανίδεσσιν ἐξειδομένην σκυλάκεσσιν.

Whereat Hecabe, daughter of Cisseus, when as a captive she beheld her home in flames and her husband gasping out his life beside the sacrificial victims, leaped into the sea and changed her aged form, which took the semblance of a Hyrcanian hound.

She jumps into the sea, without any mention of the dog's tomb or the dog's fiery eyes; instead, the city of Troy is in flames and Hecuba witnesses with her own eyes the endless destruction of her fatherland (ἐν πυρὶ δέρκετο πάτρην). This is indeed an "intriguing four-line excerpt," as Jane Lightfoot (2009, 229) admits.¹⁰ Of course, we simply cannot identify all the intertexts employed by Ovid in his reconstruction of Hecuba's death and metamorphosis, such as Ennius's *Hecuba*, for instance, which Franz Bömer (1982, 308–9) lists among the obvious sources, or even his *Alexander*.¹¹

Beyond doubt, Vergil is the most important and immediate resource for the Ovidian account, or at least part of it, especially in the case of Polydorus's death. In *Aeneid* 2, set within Aeneas's narrative of the fall of Troy, Dido is invited to visualize Hecuba and her children together with Priam *per aras* (*Aen.* 2.501–2, 515–25):

vidi Hecubam centumque nurus Priamumque per aras
sanguine foedantem quos ipse sacraverat ignis. . . .

hic Hecuba et natae nequiquam altaria circum,
 praecipites atra ceu tempestate columbae,
 condensae et divum amplexae simulacra sedebant.
 ipsum autem sumptis Priamum iuvenalibus armis
 ut vidit, “quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx,
 impulit his cingi telis? aut quo ruis?” inquit.
 “non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis
 tempus eget; non, si ipse meus nunc adforet Hector.
 huc tandem concede; haec ara tuebitur omnis,
 aut moriere simul.” sic ore effata recepit
 ad sese et sacra longaevum in sede locavit.

I saw Hecuba, and the hundred sons and their wives, and Priam over the altar fouling with blood the flames he had hallowed. . . . Here, to no avail, Hecuba and her daughters sat close together about the altar, like plunging doves under a black storm embracing the images of the gods. When she saw Priam himself, as he had put on his youthful armor, “What intent so fatal, my poor husband, drove you” she said “to put on these arms? Where are you charging? The circumstances do not call for such resort, nor for such arms of defense. No, not even if my own Hector were here. Do come over here; this altar will protect us all, or else you will die alongside me.” So she spoke and took him to herself and settled the old man on the sacred spot.

They are compared to *columbae*, clinging in fear to the *dium simulacra*. In her one and only speech, Hecuba displays what Nicholas Horsfall (2008, 401) describes in his commentary as an “affectionate gesture, not compatible with Hecuba’s alleged impatient irritation.” She places her husband back to the altar, which supposedly would protect all of them or would allow all of them to die there together. Tragically, he is destined to be cut up by Pyrrhus next. In the beginning of *Aeneid* 3 (3.13–68), the narrative centers on Polydorus and Polymestor’s crime, motivated by avarice; Priam himself is mentioned, but Hecuba is absent (3.50). No revenge is sought, just burial for the mangled body of Polydorus. In the Ovidian version of the story, however, Hecuba’s attachment to Priam and Troy is subordinated to her role as a bereft mother. As has been pointed out (Forbes Irving 1990, 208), such emphasis conforms to Ovid’s tendency to dispense with the male protagonists, such as Aeneas, for instance, and to shift the focus onto the heroines instead, such as Dido in the *Heroides*, or Scylla and the Sibyl in *Metamorphoses* 14. Elaine Fantham

(2004, 71–72) correctly observes that Hecuba’s “bereavements form the climax of Ovid’s fall of Troy. . . . Ovid reports the nobility of young Polyxena . . . but he has streamlined the tragic sequence so as to subordinate even this human sacrifice to the grief of Hecuba, whose passionate speech devotes more attention to her own death in life as Ulysses’ captive than to grieving for her daughter.”¹²

CENOTAPHS AND EMPTY SPACES

In the episode under examination in *Metamorphoses* 13, Ovid frames the Hecuba- Polyxena-Polymestor scene with images of emptiness, as the reader is invited to visualize the vacant tombs of Hector and Hecuba at the beginning and end of the scene. An important element introduced by Ovid at the end of the prologue lines, before the descriptions of Polydorus’s death and Polyxena’s sacrifice, is the focus placed on tombs.¹³ Tombs function as a turning point for our story: the reader notices the juxtaposition of Hector’s and Achilles’s tombs and can visualize them standing on either side of the Hellespont. The two rivals are juxtaposed in the text, now with regard to their tombs. But let us examine the Ovidian Hecuba episode in more detail.

The sack of Troy, at the start of the episode, summarily begins and concludes in just a few dactylic hexameters: Priam is slain, Astyanax is tossed down from the walls. After the Troades bid farewell to their native soil, Hecuba appears “in mediis natorum inventa sepulcris” (*Met.* 13.423), and more specifically at the tomb of Hector, just before her departure from Troy (13.422–28):¹⁴

ultima conscendit classem (miserabile visu)
in mediis Hecabe natorum inventa sepulcris;
 prensantem tumulos atque ossibus oscula dantem
 Dulichiae traxere manus. tamen unius hausit
 inque sinu cineres secum tulit Hectoris haustos;
 Hectoris in tumulo canum de vertice crinem,
 inferias inopes, crinem lacrimasque reliquit.

The last to go on board the fleet, a pitiable sight, was Hecuba discovered amidst the sepulchres of her sons. There, as she clung to their tombs, striving to give her farewell kisses to their bones, the hands of the Dulichian dragged her away. Yet she rescued Hector’s ashes only, and bore the rescued dust with her in her bosom. And on Hector’s tomb she left locks of her hoary hair, a meagre offering, her hair and tears.

Ovid fashions Hecuba as a caring mother who digs out the urn containing the ashes of her son, a necessary companion to her exile.¹⁵ Hopkins (2000, 168) notes here that “the detail is not attested elsewhere for Hecuba, but the carrying from abroad of a loved one’s ashes in *sinu* is described by Martial (9.30.3), for a certain Nigrina carrying the ashes of Rusticus, and by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.75)” for Agrippina carrying Germanicus’s ashes from Syria. Consider the anaphoras (using the same verb at the end of the hexameter as an epanalepsis and a quasi homoioteleuton) “hausit . . . haustos” and “crinem . . . crinem.”¹⁶ Hecuba is emptying the tomb and leaves behind a cenotaph, which she decorates with the usual tomb offering of hair.¹⁷ By portraying Hecuba in the act of fulfilling her ceremonial duties, the poet emphasizes her maternal role, substituting this image for a similar scene in *Aeneid* 3 where Andromache, a devoted widow, sits by Hector’s cenotaph making offerings to the dead (*Aen.* 3.300–305):

progredior portu classis et litora linquens,
sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona
ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam
libabat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat
Hectoreum ad tumulum, viridi quem caespite inanem
et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacraverat aras.

I set out from the port, leaving fleet and shore. By chance, Andromache was offering the annual sacrificial meal and her melancholy gifts before the city in a grove by the waters of a substitute Simois, to Hector’s remains and was calling upon his spirit at his mound, empty and made of green turf which she had consecrated, along with twin altars, a cause for tears.

Ovid transports the cenotaph of Hector, fashioned by Andromache at Buthrotum in Epirus, back to Troy, where the real tomb of Hector would have actually been; but at the same time, Ovid makes Hecuba empty the tomb and leave it behind as a cenotaph, a reminder of Andromache’s own cenotaph. Digging up the bones and ashes could perhaps point to Ovid’s own digging up of the tradition to add to the new epic portrait of Hecuba’s eventual transformation into a dog. Simultaneously, Andromache and Hecuba are connected on another level also: Andromache is a bereft mother who tends to the annual mourning rituals for Hector and Astyanax; Hecuba is soon to be left without children. In the lines immediately following this passage, the narrator offers the

details of Polydorus's death in Thrace at the hands of Polymestor. It is Thrace then that serves as the locus for the next murder/sacrifice, that of Polyxena. But let me add one more detail: Ovid likes to bring his stories full circle, and it seems that Hecuba's story is not one of endings, but of beginnings as well. If we look back at the beginning of the twelfth book, we encounter a similar episode, when Priam ignores the metamorphosis of Aesacus (*Met.* 12.1–3):

nescius adsumptis Priamus pater Aesacon alis
vivere lugebat; tumulo quoque nomen habenti
Inferias dederat cum fratribus Hector inanes.

Father Priam, not knowing that Aesacus was still alive in feathered form, mourned for his son. At a tomb inscribed with the lost one's name Hector with his brothers had pointlessly offered sacrifices in honor of the dead.¹⁸

In this passage, it is precisely Hector with his brothers, sons of Hecuba, who offer “*inferias . . . inanes*,” and Hector literally offers them in vain to a fake tomb that bears a name, that of the absent Aesacus. In the Hecuba episode, Hector himself is given “*inferias inopes*” in turn, but in this case the remains have been scooped up from the tomb: it is left as a vacant *sema*.

Ovid's emphasis on Hecuba's motherhood continues after Polyxena's death (*Met.* 13.488–93):

quae corpus complexa animae tam fortis inane,
quas totiens patriae dederat natisque viroque,
huic quoque dat lacrimas; lacrimas in vulnera fundit
osculaque ore tegit consuetaque pectora plangit
canitiemque suam concretam sanguine verrens
plura quidem, sed et haec laniato pectore, dixit . . .

She, embracing the lifeless body of that brave spirit, gives to it also the tears which she has shed so often for country, sons and husband. She pours her tears into her daughter's wound, covers her lips with kisses, and beats the breasts that have endured so many blows. Then plucking out her white hair caked in blood and tearing her breast, this and much more she cried . . .

Repetition is characteristic of ritual laments (Hopkinson 2000, 168), and Ovid prefaces Hecuba's lament by gestures indicative of such state: *dederat*,

dat, lacrimas, lacrimas, pectore, pectora. In addition, in a Hector-esque appearance (cf. Hector's "concretos sanguine crinis" in *Aen.* 2.277), "canitiem . . . suam" recalls the earlier "canum . . . crinem" (427).¹⁹ The breathless body of Polyxena is described as "animae tam fortis inane," stressing the lack of breath characteristic of the separation of the *anima* from the flesh. Subsequently Hecuba laments for her daughter's sacrifice (*Met.* 13.510–18):

nunc trahor exul, inops, tumulis avulsa meorum,
 Penelopae munus, quae me data pensa trahentem
 matribus ostendens Ithacis "haec Hectoris illa est
 clara parens, haec est" dicet "Priameia coniunx."
 postque tot amissos tu nunc, quae sola levabas
 maternos luctus, hostilia busta piasti!
 inferias hosti peperisti; quo ferrea resto,
 quidve moror? quo me servas, damnosa senectus?
 quo, di crudeles, nisi uti nova funera cernam . . .

Now, exiled, penniless, torn from the tombs of my loved ones, I am dragged away as prize for Penelope. And as I sit spinning my allotted task of wool, she will point me out to the dames of Ithaca and say: "This woman is Hector's noble mother, this is Priam's queen." And now after so many have been lost, you, who alone were left to console your mother's grief, you have been sacrificed upon our foeman's tomb. Yes, I have but borne a victim for my enemy. And to what end do I, unfeeling wretch, live on? Why do I linger? To what end, o wrinkled age, do you keep me here? To what end, cruel gods, save that I still may see fresh funerals . . .

This act, Hecuba affirms, constitutes the true *inferiae* to which she has given birth (13.516), as opposed to the "inferias inopes" she has already left at the cenotaph of Hector—namely a lock of hair and tears. As Hecuba herself foresees, nothing remains but more looming deaths to bewail (13.518), a very powerful prediction of the finale of the episode and the discovery of Polydorus's body. Actually, the poet defines Hecuba's status as an exile by the fact that she has been taken away from the tombs of her relatives ("tumulis avulsa meorum," 13.510), not away from the city of Troy. In this same lament Hecuba herself favors her role as a mother, rather than as the wife of Priam and queen of Troy. In an imaginary scene with Penelope, whose servant she is destined to be in the future, Hecuba fashions herself as the object of the gaze of the Ithacan

women, when Penelope will point to her first as the mother of Hector, and then as the wife of Priam (“haec Hectoris ille? est clara parens, haec est . . . Priameia coniunx,” 13.512–13). As Hecuba is concerned and obsessed with burial and tombs, she sarcastically excludes the option of a royal, decent burial for her daughter as even a remote possibility (13.523–26):

at, puto, funeribus dotabere, regia virgo,
condeturque tuum monumentis corpus avitis!
non haec est fortuna domus: tibi munera matris
contingent fletus peregrinaeque haustus harenae!

But, I suppose, royal virgin, you shall be dowered with funeral rites and your body buried in your ancestral tomb! Such is no longer the fortune of our house. Your funeral gifts shall be your mother’s tears; your burial, the sand of an alien shore!

The phrase “at, puto,” marks Hecuba’s statement as heavily ironic, since they are now on Thracian soil, far away from the ancestral tombs (“dotabere funeribus” points to the relationship between Polydorus and the *munera*/δῶρα of a dowry).²⁰ Polyxena will be given instead a scoopful of sand. Ovid’s use of “haurire harenam” is striking:²¹ “a handful of dust is the minimum requirement for formal burial,” as Hopkinson (2000, 181) notes. But the use of the verb *haurio* here has received no attention. And as Andreas Michalopoulos (2001, 87) observes, “It is not the sand that is drawing water, but it is itself to be drawn to cover the body of dead Polyxena.”

HECUBA’S *Metamorphosis*

As becomes clear in the scene at Hector’s tomb, reinforced by the discovery of Polydorus’s corpse by Hecuba, Ovid has shifted the emphasis from the grim role of Aeneas, described in *Aeneid* 3, to Hecuba’s grim motherly tasks in *Metamorphoses* 13. Although he borrows themes such as Aeneas’s discovery of the transformed body of Polydorus and the erection of a tomb and Andromache’s illusions in the falsely replicated city of Troy, Ovid at the same time exploits the dynamics of repetition in the tomb imagery to create a new effect. The act of emptying Hector’s tomb is of great significance for the denouement of the story as it becomes symbolic for the upcoming end: Hecuba’s scooping up of the ashes is characteristic of the behavior of a dog digging up

the dirt and thus points to the queen's own transformation into the animal and the homonymous tomb, the tomb of a dog.

More specifically, the emptying of Hector's grave is re-enacted at the end of the Thracian episode when Hecuba performs the abominable act of blinding Polymestor. The event follows the Euripidean prototype, and yet the Ovidian touches are remarkably fresh. The verb *haurio*, which the poet uses in the beginning of the episode to describe Hecuba's ritual ("hausit . . . haustos"), and later to underscore the dearth of resources to bury Polyxena ("haustus harenae"), resurfaces to emphasize the intensity of the action involved. When Hecuba is about to draw water from the sea to prepare the last rites for Polyxena ("liquidas hauriret ut undas," 13.535), she suddenly discovers Polydorus's corpse (13.533–37):

dixit, et ad litus passu processit anili,
albentes lacerata comas. "date, Troades, urnam"
dixerat infelix, liquidas hauriret ut undas:
adspicit eiectum Polydori in litore corpus
factaque Threiciis ingentia vulnera telis.

She spoke and with tottering steps of age went to the shore, tearing her grey hair as she went. "Give me an urn, Trojan women," the wretched creature said, intending to dip up some water from the sea. And there she saw the body of Polydorus, cast up upon the shore, covered with gaping wounds made by Thracian spears.

Hecuba's anger grows enormous: she is silent and devoured by pain; she is like a stone or a lioness, distressed over the death of her cub (13.538–48):

Troades exclamant; obmutuit illa dolore,
et pariter vocem lacrimasque introrsus abortas
devorat ipse dolor, duroque simillima saxo
torpet et adversa figit modo lumina terra,
interdum torvos extollit ad aethera vultus,
nunc positi spectat vultum, nunc vulnera nati,
vulnera praecipue, seque armat et instruit ira.
qua simul exarsit, tamquam regina maneret,
ulcisci statuit poenaeque in imagine tota est,

utque furit catulo lactente orbata leaena
 signaque nacta pedum sequitur, quem non videt, hostem . . .

The Trojan women shrieked at the sight; but she was dumb with grief; her very grief engulfed her powers of speech, her rising tears. Like a hard rock, immovable she stood, now held her gaze fixed upon the ground, and at times lifted her awful face to the heavens; now she gazed upon the features of her son as he lay there in death, now on his wounds, but mostly on his wounds, arming herself with ever-mounting rage. When now her rage blazed out, as if she still were the queen, she fixed on vengeance and was wholly absorbed in the punishment her imagination pictured. And as a lioness rages when her suckling cub has been stolen from her, and follows the tracks of her enemy, though she does not see him . . .

The contrast between 13.484, where the queen was “*Asiae florentis imago*,” and 13.546, when she becomes the personification of *ira*, is striking: Hecuba is gradually metamorphosed, emotionally as well as physically.²² The word used for “cub,” the generic *catulus*, is primarily used for “puppies,” as the commentators note, clearly in preparation for Hecuba’s own transformation. The lioness in Ovid’s simile uses smell to lead her to the footsteps of the man who killed the cub; “*signaque nacta pedum*” would also be an appropriate trait of dogs.

Hecuba’s transformation into a dog is a process portrayed in multiple stages, and as Sophia Papaioannou notes, is not precipitated by the destruction of the city, the murder of her husband, or the sacrifice of Polyxena, but by the discovery of Polydorus’s body.²³ While the heroine behaves like an animal, emphasis is placed on how vision is impaired for both the victim and the perpetrator, and how vision is inextricably connected to speech. At times, Hecuba fixes her eyes on the ground (“*figit lumina terra*,” 13.541), then she raises her gaze up to the sky (“*torvos extollit ad aethera vultus*,” 13.542), and all the while she remains speechless. She is “*poenae in imagine*” (13.546), as she gives in to *ira*, by which she is armed. The highlighting of clear and blurred vision is not coincidental, since the punishment of Polymestor focuses on the words *lumen* and *oculos* (“*in perfida lumina . . . oculos . . . non lumen . . . loca luminis*,” 13.561–64). *Metamorphoses* 13.549–64:

sic Hecabe, postquam cum luctu miscuit iram,
 non oblita animorum, annorum oblita suorum,
 vadit ad artificem dirae Polymestora caedis

conloquiumque petit; nam se monstrare relictum
 velle latens illi, quod nato redderet, aurum.
 credidit Odrysius praedaeque adsuetus amore
 in secreta venit. tum blando callidus ore
 “tolle moras, Hecabe,” dixit “da munera nato.
 omne fore illius, quod das, quod et ante dedisti,
 per superos iuro.” spectat truculenta loquentem
 falsaue iurantem tumidaque exaestuat ira
 atque ita correpto captivarum agmina matrum
 invocat et digitos in perfida lumina condit
 expilatque genis oculos (facit ira nocentem)
 immergitque manus foedataque sanguine sonti
 non lumen (neque enim superest), loca luminis haurit.

So Hecuba, wrath mingling with her grief, regardless of her years but not her deadly purpose, went straight to Polymestor, who wrought the heartless murder, and sought an audience with him, pretending that she wished to show him a store of gold which she had hoarded for her son and now would give him. The Thracian was deceived and, led by his habitual lust for gain, he came to the hiding place. Then craftily, with smooth speech he said: “Come, Hecuba, make haste, give me the treasure for your son! I swear by the gods of heaven, all shall be his, what you give now and what you have given before.” She grimly eyed him as he spoke and swore his lying oath. Then did her rising wrath boil over, and, calling the captive women to the attack, she seized upon him, dug her fingers into his lying eyes and gouged his eyeballs from their sockets—so mighty did wrath make her. Then she plunged in her hands and, stained with his guilty blood, she plucked out, not his eyes, for they were gone, but the places of his eyes.

Just as Hecuba removes Hector’s remains (“haurit . . . haustos”) and thus leaves a cenotaph behind, nothing has been left in Polymestor’s already empty eye-sockets (“non lumen, neque enim superest, loca luminis haurit”),²⁴ as the heroine surrenders to *ira*. Unlike Euripides’s play, the poem makes Polymestor the only victim of Hecuba’s rage. Ovid intensifies the Euripidean account by having Hecuba call for the assistance of the Troades, whom she now invokes as *mothers* (13.560) and not as Trojan women as in 13.534. In the end, however, she is the only one to bury her fingers in the king’s eyes. She uses no brooch for the action, as in the tragedy (Eur. *Hec.* 1169–71). As Hecuba falters in her role as a queen

(“tamquam regina maneret,” *Met.* 13.545), her motherly, savage, and animal instincts finally take over.²⁵ She blinds her victim as she stares at him (“spectat truculenta loquentem,” 13.558), vision and speech both distorted, the former by anger and the latter by treachery. As Marie Louise von Glinski (2012, 92) observes, “Her lack of speech is accompanied by lack of motion in a formulation that is clearly meant to recall Niobe’s petrification at the death of her children (*Met.* 6.301–9).” But “unlike Niobe whose loss of voice and movement reflect feminine passivity as a socially acceptable reaction to grief, Hecuba’s turn to revenge marks her as transgressing expectations of gender.”²⁶ Certainly, as Mairéad McAuley (2012, 142) notes, “the wondrous power of mothers to generate life can quickly mutate, in Ovidian epic, into the capacity to dole out death.”

In the end, Hecuba herself is transformed into a dog, and a tomb will be the reminder of the queen’s former human existence (13.565–75):

clade sui Thracum gens inritata tyranni
Troada telorum lapidumque incessere iactu
coepit; at haec missum rauco cum murmure saxum
morsibus insequitur rictuque in verba parato
latravit conata loqui (locus exstat et ex re
nomen habet), veterumque diu memor illa malorum
tum quoque Sithonios ululavit maesta per agros.
illius Troasque suos hostesque Pelasgos,
illius fortuna deos quoque moverat omnes,
sic omnes, ut et ipsa Iovis coniunxque sororque
eventus Hecubam meruisse negaverit illos.

The Thracians, incensed by their king’s disaster, began to set upon the Trojan with shafts and stones. But she, with hoarse growls, bit at the stones they threw and, though her jaws were set for words, barked when she tried to speak. The place still remains and takes its name from this incident, where she, long remembering her ancient ills, still howled mournfully across the Sithonian plains. Her sad fortune touched the Trojans and her Grecian foes and all the gods as well: yes, all, for even Juno, sister and wife of Jove, declared that Hecuba had not deserved such an end.

In fact, in a compilation of Hellenistic sources, especially Lycophron’s *Alexandra*, Ovid reintroduces the stoning as an integral part of Hecuba’s metamorphosis (*Alex.* 330–34, 1181–84):

σὲ δ' ἄμφι κοίλην αἰχμάλωτον ἦόνα
 πρέσβυν Δολόγκων δημόλευστον ὠλένη
 ἔπεσβόλοις ἀραῖσιν ἡρεθισμένη
 κρύψει κύπασσις χερμάδων ἐπομβρία,
 μαίρας ὅταν φαιουρὸν ἀλλάξης δομήν.



ψευδήριον δὲ νησιωτικὸς στόνυξ
 Πάχυνος ἔξει σεμνὸν ἐξ ὀνειράτων
 ταῖς δεσποτείαις ὠλέναις ὠγκωμένον
 ρείθρων Ἑλῶρου πρόσθεν ἐκτερισμένης . . .

While thee, aged captive, on the hollow shore stoned publicly by the
 Doloncian folk embittered by thy curses and abuse, a robe shall cover wrought
 of showering stones, when Maera's dusky form thou shalt assume. . . . Thy
 empty tomb Pachynus, island-cape, shall bear, a holy tomb raised by the hands
 of thy own master, urged thereto by dreams, to rest thy soul at the Helorus'
 mouth.

Hecuba becomes a black hound, "Maera's dusky form," an attendant of Hecate. But although Lycophron places Hecuba's empty tomb in Sicily, erected by Odysseus himself, haunted by Hecate and the queen because he made the first move to stone her to death, Ovid opts for relocating the tomb back to Thrace.²⁷ The κυνὸς σῆμα landmark is not located at sea, as in Euripides or Nicander, but rather on the Thracian coast. "Locus exstat et ex re nomen habet" (*Met.* 13.569–70): Ovid leaves us with the ambiguity about what happens to Hecuba's canine body—whether her remains are located in the tomb or vanish, just as her human voice disappears, becoming a dog's bark. What is left is just a place (*locus*), as the places of Polymestor's eye-sockets ("loca luminis," 13.564) were the climactic object of Hecuba's rage.²⁸ The *topos* is familiar from other cases in the *Metamorphoses* of places left in the stead of what existed there prior to a metamorphosis: as in the Erysichthon episode, for instance, "ventris era pro ventre locus" (8.805). The place takes its name from the incident, and the incident mentioned just before is that in which Hecuba the dog howls and tries to bite at the hurled stones. But the place is disconnected from what happens next: Hecuba wanders through the Sithonian fields howling mournfully. Hopkinson (2000, 186) surmises here that "Ovid seems to envisage Hecuba ranging through the countryside until she finally dies and is buried at Cynossema." I submit that Ovid's account is much

more complex. The ambiguity is intentional, since it combines all accounts, Euripidean, Nicandrian, and Lycophronean. Surely death is implied, and I believe it is implied by the temporal *diu*: even in her transformed state, Hecuba long remembers her misfortunes. And yet at the same time, *diu* denotes duration fixed in time. How long? Until she dies. And the fixed spot on the map where Hecuba's transformation and alleged burial take place is the tomb of the dog. Finally, Ovid is intentionally ambiguous in terms of the tomb itself. Is this where Hecuba is buried, or is it another empty tomb? Perhaps both possibilities are to be understood.

How important is the emphasis placed on empty space and cenotaphs in particular? As Philip Hardie (2002, 84–91) suggests, there is a possibility of seeing the cenotaph as another figure for the text, especially in anticipation of the epilogue to the poem, when the final *opus monumentum* will be finished and memorialized, but the poet himself will not be confined by spatial and temporal boundaries. In light of Hardie's assessment, let us consider the following. In the description of Polymestor's blinding, Ovid alludes to the last lines of the *Aeneid*, with unmistakable verbal echoes (*Aen.* 12.945–52):

ille, oculis postquam saevi monimenta doloris
exuviasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: "tunc hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripare mihi? Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit."
hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit
fervidus; ast illi solvuntur frigore membra
vitaeque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

Aeneas feasted his eyes on the sight of this spoil, this reminder of his own wild grief, then, burning with mad passion and terrible in his wrath, he cried: "Are you to escape me now, wearing the spoils stripped from the body of those I loved? By this wound which I now give, it is Pallas who makes sacrifice of you. It is Pallas who exacts the penalty in your guilty blood." Blazing with rage, he plunged the steel full into his enemy's breast. The limbs of Turnus were dissolved in cold and his life left him with a groan, fleeing in anger down to the shades.

Just like Hecuba, Aeneas experiences pain and anger at the sight of Pallas's belt ("saevi monimenta doloris exuviasque hausit"; Hecuba: *haurit*). The

belt, a *monimentum* itself, brings about Turnus's demise ("ferrum adverso sub pectore condit fervidus" ~ Hecuba: "digitos in perfida lumina condit," in the same metrical position). By reconfiguring the end of the *Aeneid*, Ovid displays the devastating results of anger on human beings, stressing Hecuba's vulnerability after her exposure to a magnified *ira* (*ira*: 13.544, 549, 559, 562; "poenae in imagine tota est": 13.546), reminiscent of Aeneas's in *Aeneid* 12 ("furiis accensus et *ira*," 12.946; "poenam sumit," 12.949). In the Hecuba episode, the combination of the verbs *haurio* and to a certain extent *condo* points to a metapoetic aspect.²⁹ I believe that by reworking well-known episodes of *Aeneid* 3 (Aeneas, Polydorus, Andromache) and by alluding to the last lines of *Aeneid* 12, Ovid creates his own reading of Vergil's epic. Through the astonishingly frequent use of the verb *haurio* (six occurrences in *Metamorphoses* 13 out of thirty-three in the poem), Ovid comments on his own stance within the Greco-Roman literary tradition. He draws from the Vergilian prototype as he changes the account of the Aeneadic journey and settlement to Rome. He literally and metaphorically scoops up familiar accounts and alters them by establishing new ones above the superseded story (*condo*, meaning "to bury" and "to establish"; cf. *Met.* 13.458–59 on Polyxena, "telum / conde meo"; 524 on Polyxena's burial, "condeturque tuum monumentis corpus avitis"; and 392 on Ajax's suicide, "letalem condidit ensem").

One should also pay attention to the way in which Ovid favors a Thracian place for Hecuba's tomb. Thrace as a land of barbarous transformations connects Hecuba with Procne: it is inhabited by Bistonian men ("Bistonii . . . viris," 13.430); both heroines share the same line in the poem ("poenae in imagine tota est," 6.586).³⁰ The repetition is not simply a coincidence or based on a similarity of circumstance, though: the story of Hecuba is a story of repetitions, recycling, and innovation. The approximation of Thrace to Athens in book 6 is now replaced by the proximity of Thrace to Troy, and as such it marks our narrative progress toward Rome, especially since Thrace is also the first stop of Aeneas's trip toward the soon-to-be founded city in Italy. After the etiological metamorphoses of Hecuba and Memnon, Ovid marks the place with the conventional description "scelerata limina" (13.628), just as, in *Aeneid* 3.60, Thrace is called "scelerata terra." As Thrace becomes a liminal place, where *nefas* and *scelus* abound, it is distinguished as the location where excessive anger, albeit justified and pitied even by the gods, including Juno herself, overcomes the heroine with destructive results. Retelling the myth of Hecuba gives the poet the opportunity to underscore the problematics of *ira*, not only in the context of Hecuba's revenge but also in the framework of the

Little Aeneid, in which Aeneas is chiefly conspicuous by his absence. Aeneas's discovery of Polydorus's body is now ascribed to Hecuba, while the suppression of the details of Turnus's death in *Metamorphoses* 14, confined to a single line ("Turnusque cadit," 14.573), is reorganized and recentered around Polymestor's blinding by Hecuba.

VISION AND LIMINALITY: REPETITION AND READING

By using the Hecuba episode as an introduction to his *Little Aeneid*, Ovid ponders the issue of clear vision and blinding intertwined with the notion of liminality. He plays with the contrast between safe and perilous cities, yet at the same time he sets up another pair of binaries, consisting of the *litus* and the open sea. From an allegedly safe *litus*, Hecuba realizes that neither the Thracian coast nor the open sea was to be regarded anymore as a promising place for her or her children. The polarity safe/unsafe prepares the reader for the transition to Aeneas's wanderings later in the book. As has been pointed out (e.g., Casali 1995; Myers 2009, 11–18), in his version of Aeneas's travels, Ovid highlights those elements in Vergil's poem that could be read against an authoritative and authenticating vision of Augustan Rome; that is to say, Ovid's poem constitutes the first critical, dark reading of the *Aeneid*. As Ovid appropriates the Vergilian account and constructs it as a hesitant precursor of his own opus, he fashions the *Metamorphoses* as the precursor of the *Aeneid*: its pre-text or prequel, if you wish. The scope of the transformational poem encompasses its predecessor text and goes beyond it by showing that the world is governed by arbitrary divine will rather than divine providence. The foundational voyage toward Rome starts at the ill-omened frontier of the Thracian shore. By focusing on the ominous blinding of Polymestor by the queen of the Trojans, the poet emphasizes throughout the *Little Aeneid* the idea that the heroes will repeatedly reproduce the fall of Troy. For instance, the destruction of Ilion ("Ilion ardebat"), with which the Hecuba episode opens, is counter-balanced by the obliteration of Ardea in *Metamorphoses* 14 ("cadit Ardea"), which itself looks back to the fall of Troy and Priam, as Sarah Myers (2009: 152) comments: "Troia simul Priamusque cadunt" (13.404)³¹ ~ *Ilion ardebat*, neque adhuc consederat ignis (13.408) ~ *Turnusque cadit: cadit Ardea* ... (*Met.* 14.573). It may be coincidental that both cities perish by fire, yet the reader is drawn to the annihilation of Ardea for more than six lines, with the visual transformation of the city into a bird that displays a fiery paleness to which a verb like *ardeo* alludes (14.578–79). By killing Turnus, Aeneas remains *barbarus*

(14.574), while the transformation of Ardea into a bird memorializes eternally the city's fall (14.573–80):

cadiſ Ardea, Turno
 ſoſpiti dicta potens. quam poſtquam barbarus enſis
 abſtulit et tepida patuerunt tecta favilla,
 congerie e media tum primum cognita praepes
 ſubvolat et cineres pluſiſ everberat aliſ.
 et ſonus et macies et pallor et omnia, captam
 quae deſcant urbem, nomen quoque manſit in illa
 urbiſ, et ipſa ſuiſ deplangitur Ardea penniſ.

Ardea fell, counted a powerful city in Turnus' lifetime. But after the outlander's flames destroyed it and warm ashes hid its ruins, from the confused mass a bird flew forth of a kind never seen before, and beat the ashes with its flapping wings. Its sound, its meagre look, its deathly paleness, all things which become a captured city, yes, even the city's name remained in the bird; and Ardea's self is beaten in lamentation by its wings.

The fate of Ardea recalls the fate of Troy.³² Yet the Italian city remains forever an evidence of the proto-Romans' first use of destructive violence. By conferring upon Hecuba Aeneas's distinct characteristics, Ovid underscores the latter's relative absence from the metamorphic world of his poem and insists on the Trojans' destructive violence, spread from the *limen sceleratum* of Thrace to the Italian site of early Rome. And finally, the apotheosis of Aeneas that concludes the account in *Metamorphoses* 14 is not as innocent as it appears *prima facie*, since it vividly recalls Turnus's dive into the waters of the Tiber at the end of *Aeneid* 9, with the repetition of the verb *abluere* in both cases (*Met.* 14.600–604):

hunc iubet Aeneae quaecumque obnoxia morti
abluere et tacito deferre ſub aeſuora curſu.
 corniger exſequitur Veneriſ mandata ſuiſque
 quidquid in Aenea fuerat mortale repurgat
 et reſperſit auiſ; pariſ optima reſtitit illi.

She bade the river-god wash away from Aeneas all his mortal part and carry it down in his silent stream into the ocean depths. The horned god obeyed

Venus' command and in his waters cleansed and washed quite away whatever was mortal in Aeneas. His best part remained in him.

Compare with this the following (*Aen.* 9.815–18):

tum demum praeceps saltu sese omnibus armis
in fluvium dedit. ille suo cum gurgite flavo
accepit venientem ac mollibus extulit undis
et laetum sociis abluta caede remisit.

Then, and only then, he dived head first into the river in full armour. The Tiber took him when he came into his yellow tide, bore him up in his soft waves, washing away the blood of slaughter, and gave him back in high heart to his comrades.

Repetition proves to be dangerous ground to tread as Ovid moves toward closure: there are more points of contact than of difference between former enemies. Hecuba becomes Achilles and Aeneas by giving in to rage and the powers of *ira*, as Aeneas becomes Turnus by diving into the waters of Numicius to turn into a *numen*. It is ultimately a game of repetition in reading: as Lucretius (1.404–9) likens the ideal reader to a keen-scented hound, Ovid's metaphoric imagery of "digging" finds an ideal representation in Hecuba's animal-like behavior as she hunts down the enemy for punishment ("signaque nacta pedum sequitur," *Met.* 13.548).

CONCLUSION

By recycling Hecuba, Ovid puts the queen back onto the map of epic, recasting her portrait as mother, murderer, animal. Hecuba is, as Stephen Hinds calls Medea, "an intertextual heroine," and, as von Glinski has most recently observed, "at home in different genres."³³ Ovid's Hecuba is a violent mother, whose actions are recycled from Euripides via Hellenistic poetry and Lycophron but made to reflect Vergilian Aeneas's final irate gesture. This is an Ovidian Hecuba, and, as Leonard Barkan (1986, 23) notes, "violence and inarticulateness have coalesced in the course of Hecuba's human transformations." A mother now prominently assumes the protagonist's role to end the epic cycle of the sack of Troy and re-enact the end of Vergil's poem in a manner that will perpetuate violence and *ira*, even before Ovid's tribute to his predecessor's poem begins in his *Little Aeneid*. A woman who scoops up the

eyes of her worst enemy emerges as the symbol of poetry's own perpetual digging up of tradition. Thus, by serving as a preface to Ovid's most daring account of the Trojans en route to Rome, the Hecuba episode constitutes an integral piece of the framework of the *Metamorphoses*, as the poet showcases the power of anger and blindness and offers an alternative (dark?) reading of the *Aeneid*. Are the newcomers doomed to repeat the fate of their metropolis? Although Ovid tempts his reader to respond positively, he proves as elusive as ever. I am personally inclined to pursue a dark reading here, since I believe that destruction is ominously foreshadowed—not because of the killing of Turnus in flagrante, but because of the deification itself, be it of Aeneas or Caesars, which may appear an accomplishment but in truth remains an uncertain absolution.

NOTES

1. The text I use for Ovid is Tarrant 2004; the translation is adapted from Miller and Goold 1977. For Homer, I have used Murray and Wyatt 1999 for both text and translation; for Euripides, Diggle 1984 and Kovacs's 1994 translation; for Nicander, the edition by Gow and Scholfield 1953; for Lycophron, Hurst and Kolde 2008 and Mooney's 1921 translation; for Vergil, *Aeneid* 3 and 2 respectively, Mynors 1969 and Horsfall's 2006 and 2008 translations; and for *Aeneid* 9 and 12, Mynors 1969 and D. West's 1990 translation. Otherwise, translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

2. The term "recycling" is aptly used by Papaioannou 2007 to discuss Ovid's reworking of the cyclic epic tradition.

3. Curley 2013, 21. The various sources are briefly surveyed in Bömer's (1982), Hill's (2000), and Hopkinson's (2000) commentaries as well as Dippel 1990.

4. See, e.g., Néraudau 1981. But, most recently, Curley (2013, 153–61, 185–200) provides an excellent discussion of the value of rhetoric in the episode in casting Hecuba and Polyxena as deeply intertextual heroines who employ rhetorical strategies to magnify their identity as tragic speakers and stress the inner desolation and conflicts in their psyches. Cf. also Gross 2000 on Ovidian rhetorical parody and wit in book 13.

5. Scholars until recently criticized Ovid's carelessness in announcing Hecuba's metamorphosis at the very beginning of the episode (13.404–7), the first and only such occurrence in the entire *Metamorphoses*. The most recent editor has bracketed these lines as marginal scholia that have crept into the text (see Hopkinson 2000, 164). The anticipated and foretold metamorphosis of the heroine has been interpreted as an imperfection: for instance, Due (1974, 155) briefly comments on the episode: "The lines anticipate the following story and its metamorphosis in a way which has no parallels in the poem. As a matter of fact, it is possible to cut out the Hecuba-complex and the Memnon, i.e. more than 200 lines, and continue reading at line 623: *Non tamen eversam Trojae cum moenibus esse spem quoque fata sinunt*. I think that at a

final revision Ovid would have left out lines 404–407; they seem to be a kind of synopsis.” Otis (1966, 285–86) notes that the tragedy of Hecuba “seems shockingly incongruous. Here Ovid imitated Euripides very closely but with little sense of his model’s peculiar excellences. The sacrifice of Polyxena loses all the specificity and freshness of its original. Euripides’ heroine speaks simply and her heroic behaviour is as convincing as the tears that it excites: Ovid’s Polyxena is stagey and rhetorical. . . . Ovid’s narrative of Hecuba’s vengeance on Polymestor is too brief to show the dreadful degeneration of Hecuba’s character that most readers find so arresting in Euripides. Her actual metamorphosis into a dog (which is of course non Euripidean) lacks the ‘inevitableness’ of that of Alcyone or Byblis and seems oddly ill-adapted to the preceding narrative. The whole is a smooth abbreviation of Euripides (it is only 146 lines in length) that suffers from this very fact: in condensing, Ovid had to generalize and thus to lose almost all the concreteness and actuality of his source.”

6. On Ovid’s use of Nicander, see Lightfoot 2009, 229–30.

7. See Mossman 1999, 196–201, and cf. fr. 624 Kannicht, perhaps from the lost *Alexandros*: ‘Εκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου κύων ἔσῃ (“you will become a dog, the delight of light-bearing Hecate”). Collard and Cropp (2008) designate Cassandra as the speaker.

8. Cf. also Hyg. *Fab.* 111. On the importance of the word *sema*, especially given the prominence of Achilles’s tomb, the place of Polyxena’s sacrifice, see Papaioannou 2007, 207–51.

9. The adjective χαροπός is used from Homer and the *Homeric Hymns* onward for wild beasts (lions, bears, wild dogs), but it is also used for bright, flashing eyes in general in the Hellenistic period; cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. A2.

10. Cf. Galinsky 1975, 150, on its “bald and unexciting style.”

11. According to Gellius (11.4), Ennius’s *Hecuba* was heavily based on Euripides, perhaps a direct translation of the latter—but then again, Gellius offers the same comments about Menander and Caecilius (2.23), and he is clearly wrong! In addition to Ennius, Accius’s *Hecuba* and Pacuvius’s *Iliona* (Iliona being the daughter of Hecuba married to Polymestor) may have served as immediate sources for Ovid’s portrayal of the queen of Troy; see also Venini 1952, 364–65.

12. See also Papaioannou 2007, 207–51, on the death of Polyxena, with an emphasis on lament: “Hecuba confirms the gender inversion of her daughter, while she is allowed to recapitulate from her own, anti-epic perspective major themes of the war, the fall of Troy and its consequences” (251).

13. In Pythagoras’s speech in book 15, what the philosopher remembered from the city of Ilion were the tombs standing in place of the previously flourishing city of Priam; cf. *Met.* 15.422–25. Therefore, I do not think that the emphasis on *tumuli* in Hecuba’s episode is accidental.

14. This image of kissing the earth is found a few lines earlier in the last words of the Trojan women as they leave their city: “Troia, vale! rapimur’ clamant; dant oscula

terrae / Troades et patriae fumantia tecta relinquunt” (“‘O Troy, farewell! We are forced away,’ the Trojan women cry; they kiss their land, and turn their backs upon their smoking homes,” *Met.* 13.420–21). Instead of the land, Hecuba kisses the bones of her son, touching the earth above Hector’s tomb. She kisses this part of Troy, which meant everything to her, the part of Troy that represented for her a period of safety for the city.

15. Hector plays an important role in the narration, since Hecuba is primarily referred to as the mother of Hector and then the wife of Priam: cf. *Met.* 13.487 and 512.

16. For the semantic range of *haurio*, see *OLD* s.v., especially 1, 3, 4, 5, and *TLL* 6.3.2566.79–2574.9. This verb is a strong one and has a variety of meanings; it is used in the *Metamorphoses* very often to convey that someone or something is drawn or scooped up, or that blood is shed, or that someone digs something or drinks, absorbs, consumes, devours something.

17. The lock of hair and the tears go back to Aeschylus’s *Choephoroi* (168–230), where the ritual demanded that a lock of hair be deposited on the tomb so that one might gain strength from the dead in order to take revenge.

18. Papaioannou (2007, 25–31) connects the imagery of the cenotaph to the final cenotaph in the poem, Ovid’s own “tomb.”

19. Curley (2013, 104) offers that the white color of her hair “suggests the *canis* she will soon become,” with a caveat, of course, on the quantitative difference between *canus* and *canis*. See Hopkinson 2000, 168.

20. Paschalis 2003, 158: “It is probably not without significance that the meagerness of Polyxena’s funeral ‘dowry’ recalls, and contrasts with, the Homeric use of the epithet πολύδωρος. In Homer πολύδωρος occurs exclusively as an epithet of wives (ἄλοχος), in the sense ‘richly dowered.’”

21. The *iunctura* is found again in Stat. *Theb.* 10.427, there coupled with the noun *pulvis*.

22. Curley 2013, 114: “The poet is more concerned with Hecabe’s mental transformation than her physical one. . . . Ovid shares the playwright’s focus on the dehumanizing effect of revenge.”

23. Papaioannou 2007, 227, where she also discusses the association with the Iliadic and Ovidian Achilles’s rage.

24. Curley 2013, 115: “Repeated references to eyes . . . highlight the reader’s paradoxical ability to visualize the destruction of Polymestor’s sight, which in the tragedy happens within the *skēnē*.”

25. Néraudau (1981, 39) claims that Hecuba is incapable of understanding her present status, when, for instance, she meets Polymestor: “She forgets her only individual characteristic, her age, and she forgets also the reality of her history.” I insist on the self-consciousness of the heroine in Ovid, since Hecuba is cast from the very beginning of the narrative with the foreknowledge of the future based on her

previous literary portrayals: cf. “quo, di crudeles, nisi ut nova funera cernam, / vivacem differtis anum?” (*Met.* 13.518–19) and “finita est publica clades, / sed finita tamen” (13.506).

26. The connection with Niobe is also noted by Néraudau 1981, 38.

27. Hecate in a vision forced Odysseus, culpable for Hecuba’s stoning, to build a cenotaph in her honor in Sicily. What we read in the *scholia* (ad 1181 Scheer) is, I believe, a unique extension of the story, used and manipulated by Ovid in his own narrative: ἐνθα κενοτάφιον Ὀδυσσεὺς ἰδρύσατο τῇ Ἑκάβῃ δειματούμενος ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἐν ταῖς νυξὶ διὰ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν κατάρξαι τοῦ καταλεύσματος τοῦ εἰς αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων γεγονότος (“there Odysseus founded a cenotaph for Hecuba, frightened by her at night, for he was the first among the Greeks to start the stoning against her”).

28. Curley 2013, 115: “a formula of exit rather than entry, through which Ovid leaves his seal on the narrative.”

29. Cf. the discussion in James 1995.

30. Anderson 1972, 228: “He liked this powerful introductory clause so much that he repeated it in 13.546 to characterize the vengeful Hecuba.” Lateiner (2006, 196–97) provides a brief treatment of Hecuba in the context of mothers in the poem, including Procne.

31. Obelized by Bentley and subsequent editors, including Tarrant.

32. On the closural aspects of Ardea’s fall, see Papaioannou 2005, 187–97.

33. Von Glinski 2012, 91, with reference to Hinds 1993.

Succeeding Succession

Cosmic and Earthly Succession in the
Fasti and *Metamorphoses*

DARCY KRASNE

It is no longer a secret that many correspondences exist between Ovid's *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. Their shared framework is most clearly brought into focus by the cosmogonies that open both works and by the revelation of primordial Chaos as the alter ego of Janus, Ovid's first interlocutor in the *Fasti*,¹ but Ovid has only begun as he means to go on; as Janus himself says, beginnings contain omens. Similar parallels, correspondences, and repetitions exist throughout the poems, which overtly interact with each other in multiple ways.² The "meaning" of such correspondences, of course, is anyone's best guess. Are they meant to highlight the repeated episodes as particularly significant? Are they meant to change our perception of each work when we read them side by side? Are they meant to play up (or actively blur) the differences between epic and elegy? Are they simply meant as two complementary representations of time, one synchronic and the other diachronic? Does each work complete the other? And so forth. Rather than seeking to provide explicit answers to such questions, this chapter explores some less obvious connections between the two works, revolving around the ideas of succession, repetition, and, most of all, succession *as* repetition, on both the cosmic and the terrestrial level.

A recent and productive trend in reading the *Fasti* has been "connecting the disconnected"—that is, tracing a thematic thread between disparate parts of the work, "read[ing] across and between episodes, across and between books" (Newlands 2000, 174).³ I stretch this concept further, connecting the *extremely* disconnected as well as the already-connected. To be precise, I aim to read *Fasti* 5 in light of its astonishingly orderly slew of connections not just with itself but with the *Metamorphoses*,⁴ and even more precisely, with the

overarching temporal and cosmological framework of the *Metamorphoses*, from the origins of the cosmos to the glory of Augustus's Rome.⁵

Themes of succession pervade both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, linking the cosmic power dynamics of the so-called Divine Succession Myth to the dynamics of power and succession in Augustan Rome. They are particularly prevalent in the first half of *Fasti* 5, where the entire construction of the cosmos and successive generations occurs under the guise of alternative and seemingly unrelated tales (table 5.1 outlines the structure of *Fasti* 5), and in the last 150 lines of the *Metamorphoses*, where they more clearly pertain to the quandaries of imperial succession at Rome. Moreover, these themes are not unrelated to Ovid's poetics; as Philip Hardie (1997, 189–95) has argued of Ovid's *sphragis* and self-apotheosis in the final lines of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid asserts his own self-perpetuating *fama* in contrast with the need of Rome's rulers to be replicated and aggrandized by their successors.⁶ Poetry and politics, as always for Ovid, go hand in hand, and the network of connections between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* helps to illuminate their interplay.

THE COSMOS WASN'T BUILT IN A DAY (IT WAS BUILT IN TWO)

While scholars have frequently observed that both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* begin with a cosmogony, much less attention has been paid to the second, alternative, cosmogony that appears in each work toward their respective endpoints.⁷ The final book of the *Metamorphoses* includes a cosmogony within the quasi-Empedoclean doctrine of Pythagoras (see Hardie 1995; Galinsky 1998), while the fifth book of the *Fasti*, which opens with the quarrel of the Muses over the origins of "May," features an alternative cosmogony in the form of Polyhymnia's song narrating the birth and (instant) rise to power of the goddess Maestas (see Barchiesi 1991; Mackie 1992). These cosmogonies seemingly have little in common. What I propose that they do have in common, however, is an ability to substitute, albeit in very different ways, for the original cosmogony of the *Metamorphoses*. Pythagoras's speech, of which the cosmogony is a fractional part, recasts the entire *Metamorphoses* in rational and scientific terms (see esp. Myers 1994a, 133–59), while Polyhymnia's revisionist account of the birth of Maestas recasts the allegorical/Lucretian/Empedoclean/Stoic/etcetera cosmogony of *Metamorphoses* 1 as a genealogical narrative in the style of Hesiod's *Theogony*.⁸

"Let us begin with the Heliconian Muses,"⁹ says Hesiod, and so Ovid does, in *Fasti* 5. He does not, however, begin with the harmonious, like-minded

TABLE 5.1 The Structure of *Fasti* 5

1–110	Proemial material: Quarrel of the Muses
9–54	Polyhymnia's etymology: cosmogony with Maestas
55–78	Urania's etymology: Roman <i>maiores</i>
79–106	Calliope's etymology: birth of Mercury (from Maia); Evander's journey from Arcadia to Latium
111–58	May 1
111–28	Jupiter's infancy; <i>aition</i> of cornucopia
129–46	Augustus's addition of his <i>genius</i> to the cult of the Lares Compitales
147–58	Livia's restoration of the Bona Dea's shrine; Romulus's defeat of Remus
159–378	May 2
159–82	Hyas and Hyades
183–378	Floralia
195–274	Rape and honors of Flora
229–60	Birth of Mars
275–374	Dishonoring of Flora; famine in Rome; honoring of Flora
377–78	Ovid's <i>sphragis</i>
379–414	May 3 Death and catasterism of Chiron
419–92	May 9 Lemuria
451–92	Remus's ghost; Celer's crime
493–544	May 10 Birth (and death) of Orion
545–98	May 12 Temple of Mars Ultor
603–62	May 14
605–20	Rape of Europa
621–62	Argei; Hercules and Cacus; Argive settlers
663–92	May 15 Mercury's patronage of merchants and thieves
693–720	May 20 Rape of Leucippidae; death and immortalization of Dioscuri

NOTES: This outline of the basic structure of book 5 omits epigrammatic “filler” days that consist of three or fewer couplets. For reference, these are May 5 (Lyra), May 6 (Scorpio), May 13 (Pleiades, beginning of summer), May 21 (the Agonalia), May 22 (Sirius), May 23 (Tubilustria), May 24 (Regifugium), May 25–27 (dedication of temple of Fortuna, Aquila, Bootes). Brookes (1992, 356–60) observes the change of pace in lines 721–34 (May 21 onward), as the book draws to a close with a series of epigrams. I do not mean to suggest that the epigrammatic interludes throughout do not contain material of importance, but my argument is largely involved with the more extended narrative passages of book 5.

Muses of the *Theogony* who had appeared in *Metamorphoses* 5.¹⁰ Instead, Ovid's metaphorical visit to Aganippe and Hippocrene (*Fast.* 5.7–8)¹¹ produces quarreling goddesses (“dissensere deae,” 5.9) who speak one at a time (“silent aliae,” 5.10), rather than one-for-all. Alessandro Barchiesi (1991, 3–5) observes the contradiction between the “highly traditional,” “markedly proemial and programmatic tone” of the passage and the unorthodox character of Ovid's “belated convocation of the Muses in *Fasti* 5,”¹² but regardless of the oddities, an invocation of the Muses is necessarily proemial and programmatic, as is beginning an epic—whether heroic or didactic—with a cosmogony.¹³ However, despite initial appearances, Ovid does not begin *Fasti* 5 with just one cosmogony. Like Hesiod, who prefaces the bulk of his *Theogony* (line 114 onward) with several theogonies in miniature (*Theog.* 11–21, 44–50, 105–13), as well as several invocations and even epiphanies of the Muses (*Theog.* 1, 36, 104, 114), Ovid prefaces *Fasti* 5 with an actual epiphany of the Muses and not one but three cosmogonic narratives, embodied by the Muses' competing songs and the oddly placed “beginning” at *Fasti* 5.111.

The first and fullest cosmogony, sung by Polyhymnia, begins in stereotypical fashion with chaos (“post chaos,” *Fast.* 5.11) and continues with the separation of the “old-fashioned” (Barchiesi 1991, 20n20) three elements of *terra*, *aequora*, and *caelum* (earth, water, and sky, 5.11–14), recalling the earlier cosmogonic system before sky (*caelum*) was replaced by *aer* and *aether/ignis* (air and fiery ether).¹⁴ Apart from the archaism itself, no one has discussed Ovid's reasons for using three elements rather than four, uniquely here out of all his cosmogonies. I propose that we have here not simply the three elements, but Gaia, Pontos, and Ouranos, the three procreative principles of the Hesiodic cosmogony.¹⁵ The overall Hesiodic flavor of Polyhymnia's song is enhanced by the matching of his system, and the implied personification of the elements is a necessary setup for the genealogical narrative that follows. Additionally, using *caelum* in place of *aer* and *aether* removes Juno and Jupiter from the equation on an allegorical level, appropriate for the explicitly pre-Olympian temporality with which Polyhymnia begins.¹⁶

Next, sun, moon, and stars also come into being (*Fast.* 5.15–16)—but, cautions Polyhymnia, despite the presence of the necessary physical components, the cosmos was still far from orderly, as there was no sense of rank or due honor: “par erat omnis honos” (“every honor was equal,” 5.18). Saturn, Oceanus, and Themis rarely received their due,¹⁷ until finally Honor and Reverentia married and produced *Maiestas*, who immediately put everything to rights, flanked by *Pudor* and *Metus* as she sat atop Olympus (“medio sublimis

Olympo," 5.27). A similar arrangement in the *Theogony*, where the four children of Styx flank Zeus's throne (*Theog.* 383–403), is representative of the finality and totality of Zeus's power.

Barchiesi (1991, 9) has observed the Augustan resonances of Maiestas's role as "a sort of permanent censor of the gods," whose first task is to set everything to rights by figuratively taking a census ("est dea censa," *Fast.* 5.22). However, by stratifying the celestial social order, Maiestas also paves the way for a fundamental feature of genealogical cosmogonies: the Divine Succession Myth, which Martin West (1966, 31) has referred to as the "backbone of the *Theogony*." This is the repetitive process whereby, in each generation, the ruler of the cosmos is violently overthrown by his youngest son, until finally the stable stage within which we exist is reached.¹⁸ Although here Jupiter's overthrow of Saturn is relegated to a single pentameter ("dum senior fati excidit arce deus," "until the elder god fell, as fated, from the citadel," 5.34) and time is spent, instead, on the Gigantomachy (5.35–46),¹⁹ the transfer of power nevertheless occurs and is recognized, a thing that could never have happened without the intervention of Maiestas, as hierarchy was unrecognized prior to her advent. Polyhymnia concludes her cosmogony with the arrival of Maiestas on earth and her careful worship at Rome by Romulus, Numa, and their successors.²⁰ We may assume, additionally, that it is the presence of Maiestas on earth that allows Romulus and Numa to rule and have successors in the first place.²¹

As the Succession Myth will continue to concern us as we go forward, I offer a brief refresher on the mythological tradition.²² From the beginning, we see a male desire to retard progress and retain control, complemented (and thwarted) by a female desire for progress and change. Ouranos suppresses his children inside their mother, and Kronos (aided by Gaia) deposes Ouranos by castrating him with a sickle. Kronos suppresses his children inside himself, but through the combined use of *mētis* and *biē* (and advice from Gaia and Ouranos), Zeus too manages to overthrow his father. The possibility of continuing this process of son deposing father ad infinitum always lurks as a potential threat, but Zeus (unlike his father and grandfather) always averts the crisis of potential succession, thus granting humankind a stable cosmos.

Two events within mythology are directly connected to Zeus's attempts to retain his hold on the cosmic throne: his swallowing of Metis (resulting in the birth of Athena from his head) and the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (resulting in the birth of Achilles). A third event is often also acknowledged as playing a part, if an unorthodox one, in the succession narrative: the birth of Typhoeus, either from Gaia (so Hesiod) or Hera (so the *Homeric Hymn to*

Apollo) (Clay 2006, 65–74; Vergados 2007, 53; Felson 2011, 256).²³ Although scholars have seen the threat of succession as motivating the structure of various other mythological narratives as well,²⁴ the key feature of these three putative successors in the “true” Succession Myth is their *superiority* to Zeus in terms of power, rather than simply their *equality*.²⁵ Both Athena’s younger brother and the son of Thetis are destined to be greater than their father, and while the dominance of Athena’s younger brother is only implied by his future as θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν (“king of gods and men,” *Theog.* 897),²⁶ Thetis’s son will be φέρτερον πατέρος (“stronger than his father,” Pind. *Isthm.* 8.32) and, if he is fathered by Zeus or Poseidon, will have weapons that are more powerful than lightning and the trident (Pind. *Isthm.* 8.31–36; Aesch. *PV* 920–25). Typhoeus, too, is explicitly stronger than Zeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, while in the *Theogony* Hesiod makes clear the thwarted potential for Typhoeus to defeat Zeus and become the new ruler of the cosmos.²⁷ As we shall see, all three of these potential successors—especially Typhoeus and the son of Thetis—are directly relevant for Ovid’s engagement with the tradition.

To return to the *Fasti*, Polyhymnia’s cosmogony is followed and balanced by the alternative etymologies for “May” championed by Urania and Calliope, both of whom are introduced with phrasing that repeats their description in book 5 of the *Metamorphoses*, perhaps recalling the cosmic implications of the Muses’ song there.²⁸ While Urania locates her derivation of “May” from *maiores* (“elders”) squarely in the time of Romulus, Calliope juxtaposes Polyhymnia’s cosmic and Urania’s Roman etymologies: she starts from the primordial marriage of Oceanus and Tethys (more or less concurrent with the events of Polyhymnia’s song) and proceeds genealogically through the birth of Pleione, her marriage to “caelifero Atlante” (“sky-bearing Atlas,” *Fast.* 5.83, phrasing to which we shall return), the birth of the Pleiades including Maia, and Maia’s union with Jupiter, before finally arriving at the birth of Mercury, who is worshiped by the Arcadians.²⁹ A swift shift of frame takes Calliope (and us) to the exile of Evander, who arrives in Latium (with his mother) bearing his ancestral Arcadian gods and institutes the worship of Faunus and Mercury. This mini-*Evandriad*, having brought us (and Mercury) to Italy, closes by attributing the name of the month to Mercury’s pious celebration of his mother, Maia.³⁰ Calliope’s song bridges her sisters’ competing etymologies with one that combines elements of both: a theogony followed by an epyllion of early Italy. Barchiesi (1991, 12–13) observes the neoteric features of her song and her stylistic “deflation” of the *Aeneid*;³¹ alternatively, by beginning in primordial times and ending in Italy, Calliope has wildly compressed the *Metamorphoses*.³²

Following this introductory material, Ovid begins the Kalends of May with yet another story of the early days of the cosmos that fits in the space between lines 33 and 34 of Polyhymnia's cosmogony. The theme is Jupiter in his infancy, suckled by the goat of Amalthea, ultimately growing to adulthood and deposing his father (*Fast.* 5.113–28):

nascitur Oleniae signum pluviale Capellae;
 illa dati caelum praemia lactis habet.
 Nais Amalthea, Cretaea nobilis Ida,
 dicitur in silvis occuluisse Iovem.
 huic fuit haedorum mater formosa duorum,
 inter Dictaeos conspicienda greges,
 cornibus aeriis atque in sua terga recurvis,
 ubere, quod nutrix posset habere Iovis.
 lac dabat illa deo; sed fregit in arbore cornu,
 truncaque dimidia parte decoris erat.
 sustulit hoc nymphe cinxitque recentibus herbis,
 et plenum pomis ad Iovis ora tulit.
 ille ubi res caeli tenuit solioque paterno
 sedit, et invicto nil Iove maius erat,
 sidera nutricem, nutricis fertile cornu
 fecit, quod dominae nunc quoque nomen habet.

The rainy constellation of the Olenian Goat is born: she has heaven as her reward for the milk that she gave. The Naiad Amalthea, renowned on Cretan Ida, is said to have secreted Jupiter in the woods. She had a beautiful nanny-goat, the mother of two kids, conspicuous among the Dictaeon flocks, with horns that were towering and curved onto her back, with an udder of the sort that Jupiter's nurse ought to possess. She used to give milk to the god; but she broke a horn on a tree and was shorn of a half part of her beauty. The nymph took this and wrapped it in fresh herbs and brought it, filled with fruits, to the mouth of Jupiter. He, when he held the sky's realms and sat on his father's throne and nothing was greater than unconquered Jupiter, made his nurse a constellation and his nurse's horn bountiful,³³ and now it too has the name of its mistress.

Again, the Succession Myth comes tacitly but strongly into play. Amalthea's horn is presented to the future *rector mundi*, who, in apparent cause and effect,

immediately assumes the celestial throne and absolute power after the defeat of his father (“ille ubi res caeli tenuit solioque paterno / sedit, et invicto nil Iove maius erat,” “when he held the sky’s realms and sat on his father’s throne, and nothing was greater than unconquered Jupiter,” 5.125–26). While the narration cuts directly to Jupiter’s undisputed rule of heaven and the catasterism of Amalthea’s goat, glossing over the prolonged battles of the Titanomachy that took place in between, the mention of Jupiter sitting on his *father’s* throne (*paterno*, 5.125) tacitly reminds us of the means by which he gained that throne: the deposition of his own father, Saturn. Even the initial need for the infant Jupiter to be hidden away (*occuluisse*, 5.116) and entrusted to a wet nurse alludes to the same unmentioned set of events. The story is implicitly concerned, then, not just with Jupiter’s assumption of power, but with the means by which he attained that power and the struggle between divine generations.

The relevance of the Succession Myth here is underscored by the phrase “nil Iove maius.” For Ovid, “(nil) Iove maius” (“[nothing] greater than Jupiter”), which is not unlike φέρτερος (“stronger”), serves as something of a circumventing catchphrase for the Succession Myth, always implicitly (and occasionally explicitly) alluding to its events.³⁴ Ovid uses the phrase four times: once addressed by the Sun to Phaethon in explaining the current organization of the cosmos (*Met.* 2.62),³⁵ and every other time in direct connection with the succession (and avoided succession) between Saturn, Jupiter, and Achilles (*Met.* 11.224; *Fast.* 5.126; *Tr.* 2.38).³⁶ After Jupiter overthrows Saturn, there is nothing *Iove maius* in the cosmos; but Jupiter also avoids fathering Achilles in order that there *be* nothing *Iove maius* (*Met.* 11.217–28):

nam coniuge Peleus
clarus erat diva nec avi magis ille superbit
nomine quam soceri, siquidem Iovis esse nepoti
contigit haud uni, coniunx dea contigit uni.

Namque senex Thetidi Proteus “*dea*” dixerat “*undae*,
concipe; mater eris iuvenis, qui fortibus actis
acta patris vincet maiorque vocabitur illo.”
ergo, ne quidquam mundus Iove maius haberet,
quamuis haud tepidos sub pectore senserat ignes,
Iuppiter aequoreae Thetidis conubia fugit
in suaque Aeaciden succedere vota nepotem
iussit et amplexus in virginis ire marinae.

For Peleus was celebrated with a goddess as his wife, nor was he more proud of his grandfather's name than his father-in-law's, and even if it did not befall only one to be the grandson of Jupiter, a goddess spouse befell one alone. For Old Man Proteus had said to Thetis, "Goddess of the wave, conceive: you will be the mother of a youth who will, with bold deeds, conquer the deeds of his father and will be called greater than he." Therefore, lest the universe contain anything greater than Jupiter, even though he had felt more-than-warm fires beneath his breast, Jupiter fled the nuptials of watery Thetis, and he ordered Aeacus's son, his grandson, to take his vows in his stead and to enter the embraces of the marine maid.

Surprisingly, this prophecy of Thetis's son as a potential future ruler of the cosmos is Ovid's most extensive discourse on the Succession Myth. For all that Ovid has no end of Hesiodic cosmogonic material in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, he largely avoids narrating the machinery of the Succession Myth; Saturn's fall and Jupiter's accession to power are, by and large, abbreviated, omitted, or skirted around.³⁷ Even in the *Metamorphoses'* cosmogonic material, where we might expect to find at least an allusion to the Succession Myth, Jupiter's overthrow of Saturn is relegated to an ablative absolute (*Met.* 1.113–15):

Postquam Saturno tenebrosa in Tartara misso
sub Iove mundus erat, subiit argentea proles,
auro deterior, fulvo pretiosior aere.

After the cosmos was under Jupiter's sway, with Saturn cast into shadowy Tartarus, a race of silver came in, cheaper than gold, more precious than ruddy bronze.

As in Polyhymnia's cosmogony, and as in the tale of Jupiter's infancy on Crete, Saturn's ousting is presented as a *fait accompli*. Elsewhere, the narration is not much extended: one tale (*Fast.* 3.795–808) takes place in the midst of the Titanomachy—Saturn has been deposed and is waging war—but in fact deals with an entirely different threat to Jupiter's nascent power,³⁸ while another (4.197–214) begins with the prophecy that Saturn will be dethroned by his son but turns into an *aetion* for the noisy worship of Cybele.³⁹ Ovid is not unmindful of the Succession Myth; rather, he seems intentionally to keep it just off-stage, repeatedly driving his readers to recall and reconstruct the

narrative for themselves, thus almost ensuring that they will have it in mind.⁴⁰ In Ovid, what is not said is frequently at least as important as what is said.⁴¹

Returning to the *Fasti*, the next day, May 2, again begins with a star myth, the origin of the Hyades. As in Calliope's epyllion, we return to the primordial days of the cosmos, with further grandchildren of Tethys and Oceanus: not, this time, the seven daughters of Atlas and the Oceanid Pleione, but the six daughters and one son of Atlas and the Oceanid Aethra. Atlas is described as "nondum stabat . . . umeros oneratus Olympo" ("nor yet did he stand with his shoulders burdened by Olympus," *Fast.* 5.169), which both contrasts with the epic *caelifero* ("sky-bearing") of Calliope's song and serves as a temporal marker: if Atlas is not yet bearing the sky on his shoulders, then Atlas has not yet been punished for siding with the Titans against the Olympians. However, by the end of the narrative, Atlas is "cervicem polo subpositurus" (5.180); the Titanomachy has evidently taken place while we were distracted by Hyas's hunting exploits and untimely death. The myth of the Hyades, therefore, takes us further along the temporal continuum that has already been established in the book, from chaos down to Jupiter's infancy and his subsequent assumption of cosmic power.

At this point, abruptly, Flora appears at Ovid's summons and tells him of her Persephone-like rape and the compensation she received for it—she now has control over flowers—before adding what might be her greatest claim to fame: it was through her agency that Mars was born, when Juno was angry over the birth of Minerva.⁴² Again, the temporal thread of cosmogonic narration continues as gods of the second Olympian generation come into existence, and the Succession Myth continues to lurk in the background, our attention drawn to it by Flora's mention of Minerva's birth. I propose, however, that Minerva's birth is not the only way in which the Succession Myth is relevant to the unprecedented tale that Flora narrates.

While Flora's story of Mars's birth appears to be an Ovidian innovation,⁴³ it is clearly modeled on the parthenogenetic births of Hephaestus in the *Theogony* (927–29) and Typhoeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (305–52). In both, Hera, infuriated over Zeus's apparent production of a child (i.e., Athena) without the aid of a wife, conceives a child on *her* own; in this respect, Hephaestus and Typhoeus are parallel figures in the tradition. Although it would seem logical to assume that Mars's birth here, in the *Fasti*, is simply appropriating the traditional context of his brother's birth (cf. Boyd 2000a, 75),⁴⁴ the story of Mars's birth in fact shares a number of salient details with Typhoeus's birth in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.⁴⁵ Juno goes to ask the aid of

elder gods (*Fast.* 5.233 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 334–36); she asserts a desire to do as Jupiter has done *while remaining chaste* (*Fast.* 5.241–42 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 328–30); and she goes apart from the other gods to give birth (*Fast.* 5.257–58 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 343–48). Even if there is no evident desire on Juno's part to overthrow Jupiter in the *Fasti* narrative (in contrast to her motives in the *Homeric Hymn*), nonetheless the possibility is inherent, given the intertext. As a result, Mars becomes something he has never been before: the potential next ruler of the cosmos.⁴⁶

May 2 and the Floralia come to a close halfway through the book: the first half of *Fasti* 5 has reached its end after only two days of the month have passed, and the closural device of Ovid's *sphragis* ("floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo," "that Naso's song flower in every age," *Fast.* 5.377) signals the discreteness of the preceding narrative.⁴⁷ Is it simply coincidence that the book began with a cosmogony (albeit a very strange one), continued a little while later with a tale about Jupiter's infancy that ended with a *post facto* nod to his deposition of Saturn, followed up those episodes with a story precisely concurrent with the events of the Titanomachy, and then added a tale that slots perfectly into the next generation of the Succession Myth? Coincidence has little place in Ovid, and as I have been attempting to show, the thematic repetition in these stories helps to bring deeper themes into view once they are set side by side.⁴⁸ Specifically, as we have seen, Ovid arranges seemingly unrelated narratives into an order such that, together, they substitute for a continuous narrative comprising various consecutive stages of the cosmogony.⁴⁹ I propose that the re-created cosmogonic structure here, with its various echoes of the Succession Myth, is a comment on issues of dynasty and succession in Augustan Rome.

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS AND SUCCESSION

One passage of *Fasti* 5, which we have already briefly considered in light of the Succession Myth, lends strong initial support to a political interpretation of the theme. It is well recognized that the cornucopia was a significant symbol in Augustan Rome, the message being one of "prosperity through victory and conquests" (Galinsky 1996, 115); it frequently appeared in conjunction with Augustus's birth sign, Capricorn, the aquatic mer-goat.⁵⁰ Although Capricorn and Capella are not the same, either astronomically or mythologically,⁵¹ Emma Gee has convincingly argued for an Ovidian correlation between Capricorn and Capella in the *Fasti* *action* of the cornucopia. She suggests that the cornucopia itself serves as a medium to join the two goats—it originates from

Capella, but Augustan iconography associates it with Capricorn. In both cases, the juxtaposition of the cornucopia, Jupiter, and a heavenly goat “fit[s] the same theme: the development and consolidation of Augustan power” (Gee 2000, 140). Gee continues with an important observation as to the precise meaning that Capricorn may have held for Augustus: according to Eratosthenes 27, Aigoceros (Capricorn) fought on the side of the gods against the Titans and protected Jupiter by blowing on his conch shell, which makes Capricorn “an appropriate tutelary sign for Augustus, the human equivalent of Jupiter” (Gee 2000, 142). There are, however, implications of civil war inherent in this association, both in terms of the Titanomachy and regarding Augustus’s own rise to power, and accordingly, says Gee, Ovid’s use of Capella is a safer recasting of these ideas.⁵² But Capella may not be quite so far removed from an association with civil war as Gee suggests. As we have seen, her horn appears to be directly correlated with Jupiter’s overthrow of Saturn and the civil wars that ensued. Myths of divine succession are necessarily myths of civil war, and in the *Fasti*, as in Augustan iconographic rhetoric, where the cornucopia so often is linked with Capricorn and other symbols of universal domination, the horn is unflinchingly associated with cosmic power.⁵³

We see Augustus and Jupiter similarly linked in the *Metamorphoses*. At the very end of the epic, in the course of praising Augustus, Caesar’s adoption of Augustus, and Augustus’s deification of Caesar, Ovid gives a short catalogue of sons who have surpassed their fathers (*Met.* 15.850–60):

natique videns bene facta fatetur
esse suis maiora et vinci gaudet ab illo.
hic sua praeferri quamquam vetat acta paternis,
libera Fama tamen nullisque obnoxia iussis
invitum praefert unaque in parte repugnat.
sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus,
Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea vicit Achilles;
denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,
sic et Saturnus minor est Iove. Iuppiter arces
temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis,
terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.

And marking well the deeds of his son, [Caesar] confesses that they are greater than his own and delights to be conquered by him. As for [Augustus], although he forbids his own acts to be set before those of his father, still

insuppressible Fame, stilled by no command, sets him before though he is unwilling and fights against him in this one respect. Thus great Atreus yields to record of Agamemnon's deeds, thus Theseus conquers Aegeus, thus Achilles conquers Peleus; and finally, so that I'm using examples that are equal to *them*, thus too is Saturn less than Jupiter. Jupiter holds sway over the airy citadels and the kingdoms of the triply shaped universe, the earth is subject to Augustus; each is father and ruler.

This is a strange catalogue. To begin with, neither Atreus nor Aegeus is particularly well known for deeds of derring-do; Atreus's famous deeds mostly involve internecine slaughter,⁵⁴ while Aegeus's most prominent acts are siring Theseus and marrying Medea. In addition, presumably because of their fathers' shared status as comparative nonentities, Theseus and Agamemnon are not typically leveraged as exempla for the topos of father-surpassing sons.⁵⁵ While we may hypothesize some mythographic catalogue titled "*Qui patres suos vicerunt*" ("Those who surpassed their fathers") that could have included Theseus and Agamemnon, the only place in extant mythology where we find sons who explicitly and unquestionably surpass their fathers is in the generational succession of the gods.

It is intriguing, therefore, that the third and fourth exempla are in fact drawn from the events of the Succession Myth, and in such a way as to muddy the seemingly transparent supremacy of Augustus and Jupiter.⁵⁶ While Ovid cites Jupiter's sovereignty over the cosmos as proof of his superiority over his father, Jupiter's own, unmentioned fears of overthrow by a son were based on his own rise to power and his place in a repeating pattern. The point is prefigured by the previous exemplum. Peleus became Achilles's father for exactly that reason—namely, awareness and fear among the immortals, especially Jupiter himself, that Thetis's son would surpass his father. As a result, Achilles was indeed born greater than his father, but lesser than he might have been. The word *vicit* (*Met.* 15.856) underscores the potential violence inherent in the myth and recalls the language that Proteus used in predicting the supremacy of Thetis's son ("*acta patris vincet maiorque vocabitur illo*," "he will conquer his father's deeds and be called greater than him," *Met.* 11.223).

All this begs the question of Augustus's own successor. Famously, untimely deaths repeatedly foxed his attempts to guarantee the stability of his nascent empire,⁵⁷ and by the time Ovid wrote the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, there was no longer a possibility that Augustus's successor would share any of his blood. Bill Gladhill (2012, 38) also sees the "myth" of Augustus's

own succession as standing behind the catalogue of father-surpassing sons, but he paints all three heroes with the same brush: "Is Augustus like the heroes or Jupiter? The difference matters. Agamemnon, Theseus and Achilles invoke the Orestes, Hippolyti, and Neoptolemi, the tragic successors of their tragic fathers. Jupiter is unique in that he ends succession myths completely on the divine level." That formulation would seem to put Augustus between a rock and a hard place: he can be replaced by a degenerate successor or by no one at all.⁵⁸ But Jupiter, as we have seen, ends the Succession Myth by choice, since any successor of his would, unacceptably, be *Iove maior* (not *Iove peior*). Accordingly, the question of Augustus's successor, for Ovid, may be somewhat more complex than Gladhill makes it out to be.⁵⁹

The catalogue of father-surpassing sons ends with a twist that lends support to this interpretation: both Jupiter and Augustus are called "pater et rector" ("father and ruler," *Met.* 15.860). In a context where they have just been described as sons who surpassed their fathers, especially given the great lengths to which Jupiter went to avoid further generational repetition, the explicit emphasis on their shared paternal aspect is somewhat unsettling, as it is fatherhood that leads to cosmic instability through the perpetuation of the Succession Myth. In the broader context, however, Augustus's role as *pater* is due not least to his recent title of *pater patriae* (meant on some level to celebrate the stability he ensures, just as Jupiter's control of the cosmos fosters stability), a detail that is illuminated by a parallel passage in book 2 of the *Fasti*, where Ovid informs Romulus of the differences between his *res gestae* and Augustus's (*Fast.* 2.127–44):

sancte pater patriae, tibi plebs, tibi curia nomen
 hoc dedit, hoc dedimus nos tibi nomen, eques.
 res tamen ante dedit: sero quoque vera tulisti
 nomina, iam pridem tu pater orbis eras.
 hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,
 nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum.
 Romule, concedes: facit hic tua magna tuendo
 moenia, tu dederas transilienda Remo.
 te Tatius parvique Cures Caeninaque sensit,
 hoc duce Romanum est solis utrumque latus;
 tu breve nescioquid victae telluris habebas,
 quodcumque est alto sub Iove, Caesar habet.

tu rapis, hic castas duce se iubet esse maritas;
 tu recipis luco, reppulit ille nefas;
 vis tibi grata fuit, florent sub Caesare leges;
 tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet;
 te Remus incusat, veniam dedit hostibus ille;
 caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem.

Hallowed father of the fatherland, the people have given this name to you, the senate has given this name to you, we Equestrians have given this name to you. However, your deeds already gave it: you bear your true name belatedly. You already were father of the world a long time ago. You hold throughout the lands the name that Jupiter holds in high heaven: you are the father of men, he of gods. Romulus, you will yield: this man makes your walls great by protecting them; you had furnished them to be jumped across by Remus. Tatius and small Cures and Caenina had experience of you; with this man as leader, each side of the sun is Roman. You held some small part of the conquered earth; Caesar holds whatever there is beneath high Jupiter. You snatch wives, he orders them to be chaste under his leadership; you receive crime in the Grove, he casts it away. To you, force was pleasing; laws flourish under Caesar. You held the name of “master,” he of “the first”; Remus blames you, he gave mercy to his enemies; your father made you a god, but he made his father one.

As the refounder of Rome, Augustus is Romulus’s “successor” as well as Caesar’s,⁶⁰ and he surpasses him, too, in every way. The last line of the *synkrisis* highlights the nearly paradoxical explanation for Augustus’s supremacy: it derives from his own filial piety, since, as Ovid points out in the *Metamorphoses*, Augustus himself could not become a god without making his father one (“ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat,” “therefore, lest the latter be created of mortal seed, the former had to be made a god,” *Met.* 15.760–61). Ironically or not, Augustus’s self-aggrandizing deification of his father is seen as eminently praiseworthy—perhaps the greatest of his deeds, just as Caesar’s belated act of paternity was the greatest of his (*maius* [= *maximum*] *opus*, *Met.* 15.751).⁶¹

Caesar made Augustus his son; Augustus made Caesar a god. In *Metamorphoses* 15, however, it is not just Augustus’s filial piety that makes him supreme, but the agency of *libera Fama* (*Met.* 15.850–54)—Fama who, like Augustus

himself, is ever-increasing.⁶² But following the adoption of Tiberius in AD 4, Augustus was no longer just *pater patriae*; he was now also a father in as true a fashion as Caesar was his own father. The similarity is emphasized by the mention of Tiberius's adoption a scant twenty lines before the catalogue of fathers and sons in *Metamorphoses* 15, celebrated in language that avoids suggesting that Augustus had any part in generating Tiberius.⁶³ Indeed, Tiberius's birth is attributed solely to Livia, through the periphrasis "prolem sancta de coniuge natam" ("the child born from his hallowed spouse," 15.836) (cf. Sharrock 2002a, 105–6; Pandey 2013, 442); all that Augustus contributes is his name ("ferre simul nomenque suum curasque iubebit," he will bid him bear his name and his cares at the same time," 15.837).

This a-patrilineal and ostensibly chaste production of a successor may seem strikingly similar to Juno's conception of Mars in *Fasti* 5, and I believe that it should. By the time Ovid composes *Metamorphoses* 15, Tiberius has become Augustus's heir, and by the time Ovid revises *Fasti* 5, Tiberius—the man with no Julian blood—has become *princeps*.⁶⁴ Carole Newlands (1995, 108) sees these dynastic and familial tensions as underpinning the story of Mars's birth; a connection with Ovid's wording at *Metamorphoses* 15.836 is not a difficult stretch. Although Ares was never a candidate for succession in traditional Greek myth,⁶⁵ in Rome, his own son's city, Mars is akin to Jupiter's crown prince; and if Mars is Jupiter's Roman heir, then Romulus is Mars's. But Ovid has already shown, in *Fasti* 2, Augustus's superiority to his "predecessor" Romulus.⁶⁶ Does this mean that Tiberius is primed to surpass Augustus? Not necessarily—Romulus assuredly does not surpass Mars, nor does Mars surpass Jupiter in actuality. After all, "nil Iove maius."

There is also the extremely tricky question of whether the superiority of the successor is, in fact, to be avoided or desired. Caesar delights in his son's superiority (*Met.* 15.850–51); Jupiter assiduously prevented the same. As Hardie (1997) points out, Pythagoras's story of the self-reproducing phoenix may be the best analogy for Roman succession: each subsequent ruler is to be a carbon copy of his predecessor, thus avoiding superiority or inferiority.⁶⁷ This is not precisely what Augustus himself did: while he was made successor by the bestowal of Caesar's name—successor, not ruler—he subsequently assumed a new name that, with its connection to *augeo*, expressed his potential to surpass his predecessor. Just as Jupiter changed the rules of the game in order to maintain his supremacy,⁶⁸ Augustus changed his name (again) to help ensure the same. Like Caesar, however, he too subsequently bestowed his name to ensure continuity. It remains to be seen which model Tiberius will follow:

will he be inferior, equal, or superior to Augustus? Will he adhere to the precedents set by Augustus, or will he overthrow the (recent) *mos "maiorum"*? Ovid treads a fine line, saying just enough to allow multiple interpretations.

Within Rome, it seems, there should be no Succession Myth. The son does not overthrow the father; rather, the father designates a successor to perpetuate his fame and name, and the son (hopefully) ensures that his father's fame lives. Caesar did this with Augustus, and Augustus in turn deified his father;⁶⁹ and now Augustus has done the same with Tiberius, after running out of suitable Caesars.⁷⁰ The name, of course, is all-important (see Hardie 1997, 193–94)⁷¹—and the name of Augustus Caesar on the temple of Mars Ultor seems literally to increase the building that bears it: "spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / et visum lecto Caesare maius opus" ("and he sees the temple bordered with the name 'Augustus,' and the work seemed greater with 'Caesar' read," *Fast.* 5.567–68). Do we catch a hint of *Iove maius* and the Succession Myth here, as well as Julius Caesar's *maius opus* of adoption, alongside Augustus Caesar's (*maius*) *opus*?⁷² Does the name "Augustus" fulfill its meaning by magnifying whatever it adheres to?⁷³ Does the name itself mean more than its referent? Again, Ovid provides no concrete answers to the questions that he implicitly raises.

The *Fasti* continues to offer commentary on this point, however, with particular focus on the dynamics of Roman inheritance. Mars re-enters the narrative in the second half of book 5 to witness the newly constructed temple of Mars Ultor, which Ovid emphasizes is appropriately located in the city of Mars's son: "debebat in urbe / non aliter nati Mars habitare sui" ("not otherwise ought Mars to dwell in his own son's city," 5.553–54). The temple itself is built as an act of filial and patriotic piety (5.569–80), but Newlands (1995, 101) observes additional, heightened genealogical interests in the passage: "The description of the temple also reflects Mars' family interests as founding father of the Roman race. Mars mentions by name only those Romans to whom he is symbolically or genealogically related: Aeneas, Romulus, and Augustus. . . . Mars singles out Aeneas, Romulus, and Augustus as important, semidivine figures who perpetuate his own fame and ethos." In *Fasti* 2 and *Metamorphoses* 15, it is Jupiter and Augustus who are the fathers ("hominum tu pater, ille deum," "you are the father of men, he of gods," *Fast.* 2.132; "pater est et rector uterque," "each is father and ruler," *Met.* 15.860). As Mars surveys his new temple, however, in a passage that "emphasizes the importance of patrilinear descent in the smooth transition of destined power" (Newlands 1995, 102), it is Mars and Augustus who are the *patres patriae*, the figures through whom

the succession passes. By becoming the father of the man who founded Rome, Mars has—on one level—succeeded Jupiter after all.

Yet another myth in *Fasti* 5 supplies additional commentary on the complex of Jupiter, Mars, Augustus, Tiberius, and even the Succession Myth itself. The unusual genesis of Orion, produced by three divine fathers, one mortal father, and no mother, recalls (but inverts) the birth of Mars a few hundred lines earlier. Barbara Weiden Boyd and Carole Newlands both observe this point, Newlands (1995, 110) noting that “births of this kind are not a common phenomenon,”⁷⁴ while Boyd (2000a, 80–81) dwells on the unusually pronounced absence of a mother figure. Certainly a connection can be drawn between the father-laden birth of Orion and the Roman “myth” of succession, where (as it turns out) a mother need play no role in generating the heir to the throne. However, Ovid in fact also alludes to an extant tradition that understands Gaia as Orion’s mother.⁷⁵ Accordingly, Orion’s birth may complement the tale of Mars’s birth in more ways than one: in addition to reversing it, it also reinforces the implications of the Succession Myth inherent in the earlier tale by quietly hinting at the alternative story of Typhoeus’s birth.⁷⁶

Furthermore—to climb out on a precarious interpretative limb—let us not ignore the cause of Orion’s catasterism, the scorpion.⁷⁷ In another context, this might simply be seen as adhering to a version of the traditional myth in which Earth and the scorpion were responsible for Orion’s death. However, in a context of succession and inherited power, especially as Ovid did have a choice about which version to follow, it may be that we should remember that Scorpio is (in some fashion) Tiberius’s birth sign.⁷⁸ The point is made more promising by Newlands’s (1995, 114) observation that the Scorpion’s “role as pursuer of Orion across the skies . . . is taken over by Mars Ultor. Mars’ arrival chases Orion and the other star signs from the sky (545–56).” The connection between Mars and Scorpio may suggest a concomitant association between Tiberius and Mars, while reaffirming the primary difference between Orion and Mars: Orion, with his purely paternal heritage, is more like Augustus, while Mars, with his purely maternal heritage, is more like Tiberius.

CONCLUSION

The themes of succession and apotheosis are not limited to the first half of *Fasti* 5 and the very end of the *Metamorphoses*. As we have already seen in the myth of Orion and the visit of Mars to the temple of Mars Ultor, the themes of the first half of *Fasti* 5 continue in the second half of that book; similarly, paternal and fraternal *pietas*, both relevant to the issue of Augustan succession, are

recurrent motifs throughout *Fasti* 5 (see Boyd 2000a).⁷⁹ In addition, these themes can be traced much earlier in the *Metamorphoses*, beyond the confines of the final book and in ways that again bring together the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. For instance, Sophia Papaioannou (2006) has investigated the arrival of Aesculapius at Rome as a matter of filial succession (drawing together *Metamorphoses* 1, 2, and 15, and *Fasti* 1 and 6) (see also Barchiesi 1991, 5–7), while the tale of the Coroni in *Metamorphoses* 13.685–99 prefigures the themes of *Metamorphoses* 15 (cf. Papaioannou 2006, 132–33).⁸⁰ This earlier tale, in retrospect, also links the *Metamorphoses* to the *Fasti*, as the Coronid youths are the grandsons of Orion, themselves produced parthenogenetically from their mothers' ashes much as the phoenix is produced from its father's; moreover, as it is comets, not youths, that rise from the ashes in the version of Antoninus Liberalis (*Met.* 25), Ovid may be allusively creating an early model for Caesar's comet that is directly linked to the tales of *Fasti* 5.⁸¹

The end of the *Metamorphoses*, with its linear concept of time and strong teleological drive (Feeney 1999; Gildenhard and Zissos 2004), is an appropriate place for the poet to locate themes of succession, just as the epic appropriately opens with a cosmogony. The *Fasti*, however, is circular,⁸² and we recall that it is even (re-)dedicated to the next imperial heir, Tiberius's own putative successor.⁸³ Why, then, does Ovid choose May—neither the beginning, nor the end, nor the middle—to explore the important and pertinent theme of the Succession Myth? It is, I propose, because May, the *mensis Maius*, is the month of *maiora*;⁸⁴ it is the month where “go for greater” can be the motto of success—and succession.

NOTES

Many thanks to Tim Stover and Laurel Fulkerson for their invitation to contribute to this volume, to John Miller for sending me some unpublished work on the myth of Amalthea's goat in *Fasti* 5, and to Lauren Ginsberg and Liz Gloyn for their helpful comments that, as always, enabled me to drastically improve this chapter from its original form.

1. “me Chaos antiqui . . . vocabant” (“the ancients used to call me Chaos,” *Fast.* 1.103). See, among others, Barchiesi 1991; Hardie 1991; DiLorenzo 2001. I use Alton, Wormell, and Courtney 1997 for quotations of the *Fasti* and Tarrant 2004 for the *Metamorphoses* (but with consonantal *u* normalized to *v*); all translations are my own.

2. I use the term “repetition” without implying priority of composition, which is often impossible to determine. The two poems can narrate the *same* episode (e.g., the rape of Persephone); they can narrate parallel episodes (e.g., four different

cosmogonies within the two works); they can narrate interlocking or otherwise related episodes (e.g., stories from and related to the *Aeneid*, in *Met.* 13–14 and throughout the *Fasti*); and they can narrate “twin” episodes that each shed light on how we ought to read the other (e.g., Apollo and the raven, at *Met.* 2.409–632 and *Fast.* 2.243–66). The most important work of the last few decades on the intersections between the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* is naturally Hinds 1987, while Barchiesi 1991, Newlands 1991, Barchiesi 1997, and Garani 2011 all focus on more localized correspondences; Sharon James’s contribution to this volume (chapter 6) looks at the interaction between the two poems’ handling of the theme of rape. I have been unable to obtain the recent (2012) dissertation by E. J. Goode titled “Beyond Persephone: A Study of the Twice-Told Tales in Ovid’s *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*.”

3. Newlands coined the phrase “connecting the disconnected” in this work; it was subsequently adopted by John Miller in a recent (2014) paper for the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

4. Boyd (2000a, 94–95) has investigated some of the internal thematics of *Fasti* 5, seeing in it “three major interconnected narrative patterns . . . : 1. the power of divine authorization . . . ; 2. the replication of marvelous birth stories . . . ; 3. the power of *pietas*.” Newlands (1995, 87–123) produces a unified reading of the book, while Miller (2014) looks at the connections just within the Kalends of May (5.111–58). My reading complements rather than contradicts these various interpretative forays.

5. This is prefigured in the myths of May 1; Miller (2014) shows how “Ovid [brings] us from Jupiter’s cradle (112) to Livia and Augustus (157–58).” I argue below that this temporal span is also (twice) prefigured in the book’s proemial material, the three competing songs of the Muses.

6. Hardie (1997) also observes that while Augustus may successfully immortalize his father and may expect the same from his descendants, poets have the ability to bestow immortality on *anyone* through the flowers of their poetic garland and the unsurpassed *kleos* (*fama*) that it grants. See also Fantham 1985, 252–53; *Ov. Pont.* 4.8.45–90. Ovid’s *sphragis* in the *Fasti*, set at the midpoint of book 5, further develops this idea of poetic immortalization and self-reproduction, again in connection with themes of succession, but now Ovid’s own: the metapoetic goddess Flora, who has just aided Juno in parthenogenetically producing a son, allows Ovid to reproduce himself, *toto in aevo*, through his poetry. I discuss most of these ideas in more depth below.

7. Ham (2013, 37–38) sees a “philosophical frame” surrounding both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, but while he identifies the cosmological “doctrine of the four elements” as creating this framework in the *Metamorphoses*, it is the Vestalia in *Fasti* 6 that for him forms the framing counterpart to Janus’s cosmogony in book 1. (Ham is correct in his observations; Polyhymnia’s cosmogony forms a different sort of counterpart to Janus’s cosmogony.)

8. Cf. Fantham 1985, 267–68, on the uniqueness of this Hesiodic narrative.

9. Μουσᾶων Ἑλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' αἰδεῖν (Hes. *Theog.* 1).

10. Their harmony: φωνῇ ὁμηρεῦσαι ("agreeing in voice," *Theog.* 39); "chori . . . nostri" ("our choirs," *Met.* 5.270). Their unanimity: ὁμόφρονας ("like-minded," *Theog.* 60); "dedimus summam certaminis uni" ("we granted the totality of our contest to one," *Met.* 5.337).

11. Mackie (1992, 85) observes that the precedents of "Callimachus' *Aitia* and Hesiod's *Theogony* . . . are entwined together . . . in the reference to *fontes Aganippidos Hippocrenes*."

12. The quotations (in order) come from pp. 3, 4, and 5. Ovid's con- and invocation of the Muses is also belated in the *Metamorphoses*—they convene in book 5 and are only invoked in book 15.

13. So too is beginning a work with Jupiter, as at the beginning of Aratus's *Phaenomena* (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, "let's begin from Zeus," *Phaen.* 1). Ovid does the same once he reaches the inconclusive end of the Pierides' quarrel and embarks on his material for the Kalends of May ("ab Iove surgat opus," "let the work start from Jupiter," *Fast.* 5.111). Gee (2000, 129) points out the Aratean imitation and draws attention to its displacement (it is "the first astronomical entry of book 5, but the beginning neither of the work (*opus*, 111) nor even of the book"), while Boyd (2000a, 66–67) observes that Polyhymnia's cosmogony is already highly Aratean, recalling the narrative of the departure of the maiden goddess Dike.

14. Ham (2013, 447–52) collects passages from Latin literature that refer to the four elements. The term *ignis* is preferred to *aether*, although the two seem interchangeable (cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.84, 3.30–31). *Caelum*, by contrast, seems to substitute for *aer* only in late authors (specifically, Lactantius and Claudius Donatus).

15. The accusative form of *caelum* (*Fast.* 5.14) obscures whether neuter *caelum* or masculine *Caelus* (Ouranos) is meant. OLD s.v. *caelum*²: "The masculine form is found . . . as the name of a deity." Also relevant may be the post-elemental (and, in Lucretius, post-atomic) "tripartite division of the universe" that Wheeler (1995, 97) sees in *Met.* 1 as deriving from Homer's shield of Achilles.

16. In various traditional allegorical interpretations, the lower *aer* was the anagrammatic representation of Hera, while the upper *aether* or *ignis* was Zeus, the active principle (see Feeney 1991, 149–50, 329). In Ovid's other cosmogonies, which do not deal with the succession of the gods, there is no need to be so scrupulous.

17. Barchiesi (1991, 10) relates Themis's cameo to Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus*, which symbolizes the order of the cosmos through Zeus's marriage to Themis. However, the choice of Themis may hold additional significance within the *Fasti*, as θεμῖς and *fas* are near equivalents. This may also be pertinent to the repeated prominence of Carmentis, Evander's mother, within the *Fasti*: according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.31), Carmenta was called *Themis* in Greek (or, rather, Themis was called *Carmenta* in Latin). She can, therefore, be considered the ideal *vates* of the *Fasti*.

18. There are analogues of the Succession Myth in various mythographic systems; see M. West 1997, 288–96. Mackie (1992, 85–86) recognizes the relevance of the Succession Myth to Polyhymnia’s cosmogony but sees the genealogies as more important; I see them as inseparable.

19. While it is true that Roman poets conflate the Gigantomachy, Titanomachy, battle against Typhoeus, and assault of the Aloidae (see especially Vian 1952; Hardie 1986), conflation does not necessarily imply a failure to discriminate, and it seems unlikely to me that, for instance, the fraternal/filial nature of the Titanomachy, as opposed to the hubristic endeavors of the Giants and Aloidae, is simply forgotten, especially given the clear distinctions drawn in Hesiod’s *Theogony*. (See O’Hara 1994, 222–24, for a reminder to be wary of the total conflation of these various stages of opposition by and to the Olympians.) A parallel with Augustus’s Gigantomachic endeavors may be implied (see Fantham 1985, 268).

20. Boyd (2000a) reads this, I think rightly, as an inversion of the departure of Astraea/Dike/Iustitia.

21. Naturally, Augustus embodies both Romulus and Numa, but it is also possible to imagine Caesar as Romulus to Augustus’s Numa, which adds another dimension to the present reading. See below for the political ramifications of these themes.

22. For simplicity’s sake, I follow the Hesiodic system here (see Clay 2003 for a detailed analysis); although there are a plethora of variants in non-Hesiodic systems of cosmogony, the basic framework remains more or less the same.

23. See also Yasumura 2011 on various challenges to Zeus’s power. For the sake of convenience and clarity, I refer to the gods’ opponent as “Typhoeus” throughout, although his name takes multiple forms in the tradition, even within the same author.

24. Mythology is rich with inherent possibility: Apollo might be a threat were he not eternally an ephebe and therefore intrinsically less powerful than his father; Athena might, too, were she not female. Hermes, as the last-born of the Olympians, is in the appropriate position to overthrow his father; Prometheus, as the descendant of another Titanic line, may engineer the trick at Mekone as a bid for laying claim to the cosmic throne; and so forth. See Clay 2003, 106; Vergados 2007, 53; Felson 2011, for these and other arguments; Clay (2006) argues that all of the long *Homeric Hymns* implicate the Succession Myth and the organization of the cosmos on at least some level.

25. Felson (2011, 264) observes that “‘equality’ seems to invite competition,” but that does not mean it allows even a remote possibility of success.

26. He also will have a *ὑπέρβιον ἤτορ* (“overweening heart,” *Theog.* 898); the prefix *ὑπερ-* may suggest his superiority.

27. *ἀλλ’ ὁ γε φέρτερος ἔστω δσον Κρόνου εὐρύσπα Ζεύς* (“but let him be as much stronger as Zeus was compared to broad-eyed Kronos,” *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 3.339); *κεν ὁ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάξεν*, / *εἰ μὴ ἄρ’ ὄξυ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* (“and he would have ruled over mortals and immortals, had not the father of gods and men paid keen attention,” *Theog.* 837–38).

28. Urania: “excipit Uranie” (“Urania followed after,” *Met.* 5.260, *Fast.* 5.55). Calliope: “surgit et immissos hederæ collecta capillos / Calliope” (“Calliope rises, her loose hair gathered together with ivy,” *Met.* 5.338–39); “tunc sic, neglectos hederæ ridimita capillos, / prima sui coepit Calliopea chori” (“then thus began Calliopea, first of her own chorus, her neglected hair wreathed with ivy,” *Fast.* 5.79–80). Is Calliope neglecting her hair because Ovid has moved outside her epic purview? The cosmic overtones of the Persephone epyllion in *Met.* 5 are prominent: when Venus decides that it is time to bring both Pluto and Proserpina under her sway, she phrases it to Cupid in terms of power (*Met.* 5.369–72), as she wants the full cosmos under her control (see Hinds 1987, 108–11; Barchiesi 1999, 115–17; Johnson 2008, 64–71). She continues by naming the three goddesses who evade her power (*Met.* 5.375–77). Although prefacing Ovid’s “Homeric Hymn to Ceres,” these three lines are drawn directly from the preface to the (actual) *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, thus alluding to a future story in which she will finally be subjugated by Jupiter: Venus will not be successful in her bid for total dominion, except perhaps in Ovid’s own erotocentric poetic corpus. It may be relevant to the cosmic overtones that Cupid—like Typhoeus, perhaps—is the only one who can overcome Jupiter (cf. *Apul. Met.* 4.33.5–8).

29. See Boyd 2000a on the importance of Mercury in *Fasti* 5.

30. Ovid, in the previous book (*Fast.* 4.61–84), had already used Evander, as well as Hercules, Ulysses, Telegonus, Halaesus, Antenor, Aeneas, and Aeneas’s companion Solimus, as examples of Greeks (and Trojans) who came to early Italy, thereby explaining why the name of a Roman month might have a Greek derivation.

31. See Fantham 1992b on the Aeneas-like role that Evander plays in the *Fasti* as an alternative founder figure.

32. Polyhymnia’s cosmogony implicitly does the same, by setting its unorthodox *prima origo mundi* in direct engagement with Ovid’s own *tempora* through the Augustan/Tiberian theme of *maiestas*. (See Fantham 1985, 266–73, on the continued relevance of *maiestas* under Tiberius.)

33. Or, possibly, “made into stars his nurse and his nurse’s bountiful horn.” The plural *sidera* and the structure of the Latin are ambiguous; nowhere else does the cornucopia seem to be envisaged as a constellation, but on the other hand, Capella is normally a single star, rather than a constellation (it is part of the asterism Capra, comprising Capella and her two Haedi, “kids”), which *signum* at 5.113 seems to contradict. See Brookes 1992, 77–78, on the ambiguities of meaning (most scholars tacitly opt for one interpretation or the other); see Gee 2000, 128–29, on the astronomy of the star Capella.

34. Gee (2000, 146) sees the phrase as “a cliché of Augustan panegyric . . . signal[ing] an assimilation of Augustus and Jupiter.” While I agree that there may be an implicit assimilation of Augustus and Jupiter in the recurring phrase, I do not see fulsome praise.

35. On this story of cosmos-impacting father/son dynamics, see chapter 1 in this volume, by Andrew Feldherr.

36. Valerius Flaccus, always a careful reader of Ovid, picks up on this phrase and reuses it in the exact same context: Thetis sighing that her son will not be born “Iove maiorem” (“greater than Jupiter,” *Argon.* 1.133). An inversion of the phrase *Iove maius* may be visible in “Saturnus minor est Iove” (“Saturn is less than Jupiter,” *Met.* 15.857), which again has both Augustan and cosmic implications; see the section “Strategies for Success and Succession,” below.

37. References to Jupiter’s overthrow of his father: *Met.* 1.113–14; *Fast.* 1.235–36, 3.796–98, 4.197–200, 5.34, 5.125–26. The same abbreviation or outright omission tends to occur in the next generation, and Saturn’s overthrow of Uranus is never mentioned.

38. There may be hints of an alternative, non-Hesiodic Succession Myth in the story of Briareus, whom Ovid presents as a contender for universal power. Homer gives “Briareus” as the alternative name of Aigaion, calling him “greater in strength than his father” (ὁ γὰρ αὐτε βίην οὐ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, *Il.* 1.404), while the epic *Titanomachy* (which makes Aigaion a son of Pontos and Gaia [fr. 3 West] and therefore the descendant of an alternative, non-Ouranian genealogy) may have cast Aigaion as a Typhoeus-like challenger to Zeus (cf. *Aen.* 10.565–68; see M. West 2002, 111–12); Callim. *Hymn* 4.141–47 may also preserve vestiges of such a tale. In the *Fasti*, the story of the bull-serpent monster that Gaia produces during the Titanomachy, which Briareus tries to sacrifice, splits into two the Hesiodic story of Typhoeus: the bull’s birth mimics that of Typhoeus, but the challenge to Jupiter’s power comes from Briareus. Given the fragmentary nature of our evidence, this line of thought is necessarily a rabbit hole, but an interesting and pertinent one.

39. This latter seems complementary to the prophecy of Thetis’s powerful son in *Met.* 11.

40. Mack (1988, 141) puts the point well: “Ovid experiments with the many ways a story can be told: one way is not to tell it at all. In order to make your reader see that you are not telling it, you have to bring it to his attention and then move off in another direction.”

41. Chapter 6 in this volume, by Sharon James, explores the idea of “invoking without mentioning” in the context of Rome’s foundational rapes and their tacit incorporation—through their omission—into the *Metamorphoses*.

42. The story of Flora’s rape (*Fast.* 5.195–212), together with the later story of a famine that she caused at Rome after being deprived of due honor (5.279–330), suggests the complete story of Ceres and Proserpina; as Ovid has just narrated the full tale in the previous book, it will be fresh in the reader’s mind. This may well be another cosmogonic tale lurking below the surface of *Fasti* 5, albeit one whose events are less clearly defined temporally; the version in *Met.* 5 has additional cosmic implications beyond the etiology of the seasons (see n. 28 above).

43. See Porte 1983 on Ovid’s possible inspiration.

44. Newlands (1995, 107) sees in Mars’s parthenogenetic birth a possible parallel to Erichthonius (whom she calls “Erechtheus,” sometimes the same figure and sometimes

a different one), one of the early ancestors of the Athenians, especially “if we see [Flora’s] flower as equivalent to the semen that brushes Athena’s thigh.” But the birth is far closer to that of Erichthonius’s father, Hephaestus. This could still support Newlands’s broader point, namely that the Ovidian circumstances of Mars’s birth are meant to set Rome in parallel to Athens, but understanding the revised myth exclusively in this light strips it of much of its significance.

45. Typhoeus himself receives scant mention in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, appearing only at *Met.* 5.321–31 and 5.346–58 and at *Fast.* 2.461–64.

46. I shall return to this point below.

47. Flora, the goddess to whom (as it turns out) Rome owes its very existence, is equally responsible for Ovid’s own poetry (see Newlands 1995, 108–10, 122–23, on the metapoetic status of Flora in the *Fasti*). Newlands (1995, 110) and Boyd (2000a, 77) also argue that Mars himself is conceived of here as a literary creation (“per nostras editus artes,” “produced/published through our arts,” *Fast.* 5.229).

48. Boyd (2000a, 78) has previously argued for a connecting strand of marvelous births that runs through *Fasti* 5 and links the birth of Jupiter to the birth of Mars, but she refutes a deeper thematic (or systematic) connection deriving from the particular stories that Ovid chooses, finding meaning primarily in the overarching themes highlighted by the repetition; see n. 4 above for the other important themes she isolates in *Fasti* 5.

49. In yet another echo of the book’s opening cosmogonies, this sublimated narrative also ends with a Roman coda (*Fast.* 5.259–330). The sort of “reconstituted” narrative for which I am arguing here—where an unmentioned narrative is told in bits and pieces through other, unrelated narratives—is a possibly fundamental feature of the *Metamorphoses* on which some recent, localized work has been done. See Mack 1988, 136–41; Newlands 1997; Gildenhard and Zissos 2000; Gildenhard and Zissos 2004; Boyd 2006; Krasne 2011, 26–38. The parallel narrative mode helps to support the idea that *Fasti* 5 on some level mimics the *Metamorphoses*.

50. The cornucopia and Capricorn were both important iconographic symbols of Augustus’s rule; see Taylor 1931, 165–66; Zanker 1988, *passim*; Barton 1995; Galinsky 1996, 106–18; Gee 2000, 135–42; Wray 2002.

51. Capricorn (the half-goat Aigoceros, son of Aigipan) is a constellation in its own right, whereas Capella (Amalthea) is one star in the asterism Capra, itself part of the constellation Auriga.

52. Gee 2000, 142: “Ovid’s Capella carries the same set of associations as Capricorn, but is one step removed from civil war and its propaganda, a demilitarised form of Capricorn, pertaining more to the youth of Jupiter than to his *fulmina*.”

53. Cf. Galinsky 1996, 107: “Fruitfulness and prosperity are not simply handed down by the gods. Instead, they are the result of Rome’s dominance, which is based on efforts in war.” A contradictory *action* of the cornucopia appears at *Met.* 9.85–92, where it is derived from the river god Achelous’s horn, sheared off by Hercules in

their wrestling match over the hand of Deianira. The *Metamorphoses*' cornucopia is directly relevant to the correspondence between *Fasti* 5 and the *Metamorphoses*: this is the one place where they—and, indeed, the two poems in their entirety—outright fail to agree, and the repetition forges a link between *Fasti* 5 and the central books of the *Metamorphoses* to complement the links with *Met.* 1 and *Met.* 15 that I discuss in this chapter. Moreover, its context is highly relevant to the themes of succession and paternity. I plan to investigate this important parallel elsewhere (see Krasne 2011, 14–51, for an initial formulation of these ideas).

54. Atreus and Thyestes teamed up to murder their half brother Chrysippus; subsequently, in revenge for his wife's adultery with Thyestes, Atreus fed Thyestes's own children to him, a crime so horrible that the Sun reversed his course.

55. In addition, there are alternative accounts of the paternity of both Theseus and Agamemnon; the former is also sired by Neptune (whether instead of or in addition to Aegeus), and the latter is sometimes said to be the son of Pleisthenes (Hes. *Cat.* 137a, b, c Most; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.2.2§15). Whichever way the point is interpreted, one finds an echo of the exchange between Agamemnon, Diomedes, and Sthenelus at *Il.* 4.364–410, where Agamemnon rebukes Diomedes for being χέρεια μάχη, ἀγορή δέ τ' ἀμείνω (“worse in battle and better in the assembly,” 4.400) than his father, and Sthenelus rejoins that they are in fact πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες (“far better than our fathers,” 4.405); although Agamemnon does not say as much, the idea of inevitable generational heroic decline (such as Nestor expresses at *Il.* 1.266–72) is inherent in his snub.

56. Gladhill (2012, 38) too sees this catalogue as drawing on the Succession Myth, although he reads its ramifications differently (see below).

57. On Augustus's succession policy, see Sumner 1967; Corbett 1974; Crook 1996, 82–112; Gruen 2005.

58. For Neoptolemus's degeneracy, cf. his own words at *Aen.* 2.547–49; the other two are both failed ephebes, but perhaps not “degenerate” beyond their inability to succeed their fathers.

59. It will be clear that I also do not fully subscribe to the reading of the succession at Gladhill 2013, 313–15, where he again argues that because the shadows of Orestes, Hippolytus, and Neoptolemus hang behind their more glorious fathers, Ovid here “encodes tragic undertones . . . to Augustus' usurpation of Caesar's glory” (314) and to the question of who might suitably succeed Augustus (answer: no one).

60. Suetonius records that the Senate proposed to call Octavian “Romulus”—“quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis” (“as if he himself were also the founder of the city,” *Aug.* 7.2).

61. Hardie 1997, 190–91: “In the last episode of the [*Metamorphoses*] the two themes of apotheosis and succession are tightly woven together. The son Augustus honours his father Julius with deification, and the deified Julius in turn sheds lustre on his son.” But he also sees another filial/paternal relationship bound up in the

phrase “maius opus,” namely Ovid’s debt to (and simultaneous independence from) the *Aeneid*.

62. *Augustus* derives from *augeo*, “increase”; see Hardie 1997, 193–95. For Fama’s increasing size, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.174–90. Hardie (2005, 118–20) connects Vergil’s Fama with Hesiod’s Typhoeus, both of them the last-born children of Earth and described with remarkably similar traits. See Tissol 2002 on the problems with Fama as the source of Augustus’s greatness; Gladhill (2013) aligns the seditious, Republican voice of Fama with Ovid’s own voice.

63. On the other hand, the similarity is simultaneously downplayed by the highly genealogical language that Ovid uses of Caesar’s “fathering” of Augustus (*genuisse*, *Met.* 15.758; “mortali semine cretus,” 15.760). Sharrock (2002a, 105) notes “the ironic stress on the genetic significance of Caesar’s fathering of Augustus.”

64. Corbett (1974), however, argues that bloodline was never a concern of Augustus’s and that Tiberius had been his first choice for successor more or less since Agrippa’s death.

65. Clay (2011, 250) does see potential relevance to the Succession Myth in Demodocus’s song of Ares and Aphrodite in the *Odyssey*, but only on the level of the persistent tension in the myth between *mētis* and *biē* (here represented by Hephaestus and Ares, respectively); on Ovid’s double use of this myth, see chapter 2 in this volume, by Barbara Weiden Boyd.

66. The *Fasti* 2 passage must be from a pre-revision version of the poem, as Augustus is clearly alive; it may well have been composed with the express intention of corresponding to the passage in *Met.* 15.

67. Hardie 1997, 193–94: “Julius Caesar’s solution [to the question of succession] is to fabricate a ‘natural’ son and give him a name which is also his own; this is the fiction of the ideal succession of the same by the same. . . . Ideally the imperial succession should replicate that of the (self-evidently fictional) phoenix, . . . a type of the Julian *gens* in its pious (405 *pīus*) consecration of its father.” Where the divine Succession Myth requires one who is φέρτερος than his predecessor, succession in Rome should rely on sameness.

68. Clay 2003, 28: “In swallowing the pregnant Metis, Zeus reiterates the first two episodes of the succession myth, but with a difference; in giving birth to Athena, he appropriates the female function of procreation; and he permanently incorporates into himself the feminine principle of guile (*metis*) that had hitherto been the instrument of generational change.”

69. Although Caesar adopted Octavian in his will, making him a duplicate of himself (C. Iulius Caesar), the true duplication may have gone in the other direction, as Barchiesi (2001b, 77) suggests: “Augustus molds Caesar into a ‘double’ of himself.”

70. Hardie 1997, 195: “The matchless poet at the very end [of *Met.* 15], with no anxiety about *his* succession, stands in pointed contrast to the difficulties of finding an imperial successor. The contrast becomes sharper, barbed even, if the concealed

agenda in the last 120 lines of the poem is not the heir to Julius Caesar, but the succession to Augustus in the 'teens of the first century CE."

71. Fantham (1985, 260), in addition, sees the adoptive name changes as "imposing surface unity on what we know to have been a tension-ridden family."

72. Hardie (1997, 191) points to the poetic implications of *maius opus* in Caesar's adoption of Augustus (see n. 61 above); does the same hold true here, with Mars's temple tacitly compared to Ovid's *Aeneid*-surpassing poetic production? Gee (2000, 143) suggests that the catchphrase *Love maius* is meant to reflect the increasing nature of Augustus: "The wordplay . . . helps us to associate Augustus, Jupiter, and the growth of Rome."

73. A similar notion is suggested by *Tr.* 4.2.9, although "Augustus" is omitted: "Caesareo iuvenes sub nomine crescunt" ("the youths grow under Caesar's name").

74. Newlands (1995, 111) also points out the pertinence of the myth's location within the book: "Directly before Mars plays a major role in the poem as patriarchal head of the Roman people, the unusual birth of Orion serves to remind us of Mars' birth from Juno alone."

75. The earth that covers the ox hide ("superiniecta texere madentia terra," "they covered the dripping [hide] with earth heaped over it," *Fast.* 5.533) becomes a surrogate mother figure in the same fashion that the earth that conceals Tityos becomes his mother (Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.762–63), even though Zeus actually begot Tityos on Elara (whom he then hid beneath the earth). Explicit references to Earth as Orion's mother can be found at Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.3§25 (γηγενῆ, "earth-born") and Nonnus, *Dion.* 13.98–103; the latter clearly suggests the same line of thinking as for Tityos's parentage. The birth of Erichthonius, too, follows the same pattern: both Gaia and Athena are thought of as his mother.

76. As we saw above, the more common (and Hesiodic) version makes Typhoeus the son of Gaia rather than Hera.

77. Boyd (2000a, 83–84) notes that "Ovid's reticence about the actual cause of Orion's death is curious: does the scorpion get him or not?"

78. Although Boyd (2000a, 83n65) makes no connection with Tiberius, she does observe that "in the struggle between Orion and a monster produced by Earth can also be heard an echo of the cosmogonic tale . . . in Polyhymnia's story of Maiestas." The importance of Tiberius's birth sign in Rome can be seen, for instance, on the Gemma Augustea (Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. inv. IX A 79). Often only the symbol of Capricorn alongside Augustus's head in the upper register is discussed, but Tiberius's Scorpion is also present, engraved on the shield at the far left of the lower register (see Zanker 1988, 230–32). Barton (1994, 45) observes that we lack a full understanding of Tiberius's sign: both Scorpio and Libra (the latter once connected to Scorpio as its Claws, the *Chelae*, but reimagined as a balance by the early empire; cf. Manil. *Astr.* 4.547–52) seem to be associated with Tiberius. However, as she points out elsewhere (Barton 1995, 42), it was possible to "accept more than one birth-sign."

79. In particular, as Fantham (1985, 259) points out, the prominence of the Dioscuri (and the oddly unproblematic Romulus and Remus?) may pertain to the brothers Tiberius and Drusus or the adoptive brothers Germanicus and Drusus—or even, to extend Fantham’s observation, to the deceased Gaius and Lucius, who were the first to be associated with the Dioscuri as imperial heirs and *principes iuventutis* (see Poulsen 1991, 122–26). In addition, the prominence of the soon-to-be-apotheosized Hercules throughout the book suggests themes of imperial apotheosis, while the *hapax legomenon* “sidus Hyantis” in the last line of *Fasti* 5 may conceivably allude to the *sidus Iulium*.

80. See Barchiesi 1997 on closural devices in the *Metamorphoses*.

81. The phrase “signis fulgentibus” (“gleaming symbols,” 13.700), although ostensibly used simply of the engraved images, may suggest the celestial *signa* of Antoninus’s version, which may well have also been the version in Nicander’s *Heteroioumena*.

82. Nonetheless, Littlewood (2006, 215) observes that the “concentration of myths of apotheosis at the end of” *Fasti* 6, many of which are also to be found at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, signals impending closure. As always, multiple strata of meaning and structure can be operative at once.

83. On the dynamics of power as they pertain to Germanicus in the *Fasti* and elsewhere in the exile poetry, see Fantham 1985; Fantham also argues for a late composition or reworking of at least the introductory section of *Fasti* 5.

84. The stem *mai-* shows up twice as many times in *Fasti* 5 as in any other book of the *Fasti*. See Brookes 1992, 22–28, on the prevalence of *magnus*, as well, in the opening etymologies.

Rape and Repetition in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Myth, History, Structure, Rome

SHARON L. JAMES

If it is not a truth universally acknowledged that Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is much occupied with rape, it should be. Even casual readers can hardly fail to perceive the astonishingly high incidence of rapes or attempted rapes that are related or mentioned, many following a pattern that surpasses repetition to become virtually predictable, even given variations in individual tales. In particular, the first five books, especially books 1 and 2, are marked by an insistent, repeated structure in which a male god sees a human girl and either performs a hit-and-run rape or tries to do so. The poem moves from the beginning of the physical universe ("primaque ab origine mundi") to undatable Greek myth to Roman foundational legend, right up to Ovid's own times ("ad mea . . . tempora," *Met.* 1.3–4). It thus raises questions about the relationship of these rapes to those mythic Greek beginnings, to Roman history, and, ultimately, to Rome itself, as well as questions about the ways in which Ovid's Roman readers experienced rape and repetition in the poem.¹ I argue here that the rape tales are broadly patterned to raise, then frustrate, expectations about the mytho-historical rapes that underlie Rome's very foundation. This pattern engages with the *Fasti*, which Ovid was composing simultaneously, and the first two books of Livy, in a fashion perhaps best described as counter-intertextual.² My argument focuses on the experience of the Roman readers as they make their way through this long poem, whose many stories constantly invoke their knowledge of other sources and versions,³ and of analogous episodes in other traditions, particularly their own Roman mythic history,⁴ hoping in this way to support some conclusions about rape and repetition, myth and history in the poem.⁵

The *Metamorphoses* contains forty-six episodes of what might be called “sexual interference” (a deliberately vague term), ranging from the standard hit-and-run assault on an unattended girl, to enforced acceptance of a son-in-law who cannot be refused (Perseus), to open attempts at stealing a bride, as when Phineus protests the marriage of Perseus and Andromeda (book 5) or Eurytus tries to abduct Hippodame (book 12).⁶ Some rough statistics are in order here: fourteen, or about one-third, of these episodes occur in books 1 to 5; book 6 contains Arachne’s tapestry, with another eighteen, as well as the stories of Philomela and Orithyia. Thus, books 1 to 6 contain almost 75 percent of the poem’s stories of sexual interference. This structure is not accidental, and it exercises a powerful effect on the reader, whose expectations are shaped by the relentless repetition of rape in the opening books. In the stories of rape, the victim’s agreement is not sought by the would-be or actual rapist/abductor, who has no concern for her attitude. In no case does the object of the sexual interference seek out a sexual relationship in advance, and in most cases she objects vigorously, in both speech and act.⁷

DEFINITIONS

In defining my terms, I draw from the work of Patricia Rozée, who speaks not of a woman’s *consent* to an act of sex—because consent can be coerced—but of a woman’s *choice*. She argues that we should define rape not as sexual contact without the victim’s consent, but as sexual contact that the victim does not choose.⁸ This aspect of rape is regularly on view in the *Metamorphoses*, where Ovid repeatedly shows that women try to avoid sexual assault, that they fear predatory male sexuality, that they do not choose sexual contact, and that they seldom actually consent to it.⁹ Many of the poem’s rape victims are the mothers of heroes, even of Olympian gods, or receive other distinctions, but even a girl who ceases to resist, as Leucothoe does in book 4, might have preferred not to be so distinguished by a god.¹⁰ If Orithyia assents to becoming a wife, in *Metamorphoses* 7 (and Flora in *Fasti* 5), would she have done so if given actual freedom to choose? The number of mythic victims who seek to be rendered un-rapable, sometimes after the fact, attests to a recognized eagerness to exercise choice—even if that choice is to become a tree (Daphne, book 1), a reed (Syrinx, book 1), a crow (Cornix, book 2), a pool (Arethusa, book 5), a flower (Lotis, book 9), or an invulnerable man (Caenis, book 12). That is, even as it focuses chiefly on males in pursuit or on magical outcomes, Greek myth dramatizes women’s reluctance, avoidance, and resistance of forcible sex. It takes Ovid to compile these episodes in such a way as

to showcase the women's resistance to sex. Thus, I propose, we may say that Ovid recognizes that forced consent is not the same thing as free choice.

PATTERNS OF RAPE IN THE *Metamorphoses*

Table 6.1 shows the types of rape that are found in the *Metamorphoses*. The episodes of sexual interference fall into four categories: (1) the standard girl-grabbed-by-god situation—a group that accounts for thirty-five of the forty-six tales (this category includes Hermaphroditus); (2) the daughter taken to become a wife, regardless of her parents' approval; (3) a wife upon whom some form of sexual interference is attempted; (4) and, finally, the daughter converted into a rape captive or slave, a category limited, in Ovid, to Philomela, and in Livy to Verginia.

This table lays out the structure of rape episodes in the *Metamorphoses*. Rapes of category 1 are located primarily in the first five books, with a massive, stunningly compact, coda of eighteen episodes catalogued in the twenty-three lines describing Arachne's tapestry. In this first, and most populous, category—the snatch-and-grab rape—a high incidence of etiology attaches to the tale. How did the laurel come to be Apollo's tree? Why is the crow black? What is the story of Ursa Major and Ursa Minor? As noted above, magical offspring—heroes, kings, Muses, even Olympian divinities—are born to some rape victims (Europa, Leda, Alcumena, Danae, Mnemosyne, Philyra, Tyro, among others), who thus gain some kind of reward for their suffering, a special, sometimes foundational, status. Often the victim suffers brutal punishment from a third party, usually Juno or the junior goddess whose devotee she has been (e.g., Io, Callisto, Medusa). If the rape fails, she may be converted to a sign or instrument of the pursuing god, as with Daphne and Syrinx (book 1).¹¹ This type of rape tale in Greek myth performs a double function: it dramatizes cultural values and attitudes toward the female body, and it also provides explanations for both natural and ktistic phenomena. For Ovid's original readers, this model of rape is a historical foundation of their *urbs*, as recounted in the tale of Mars and Rhea Silvia.

The rapes in categories 2–4, belonging in the world of cities, kingdoms, politics, and alliances (rather than the free pastoral range of much of category 1), are placed in no particular pattern in the poem. Because they disrupt legitimate marriage traffic (conducted by fathers), these rapes resonate more with the historical, cultural, and political consciousness of Ovid's Roman readers. In other words, categories 2–4 speak to specifically Roman themes. But the responses of the victims in category 1 offer a paradigm for the women of categories 2–4.

TABLE 6.1. Rapes in the *Metamorphoses*

1. Greek mythic hit-and-run rape of girl or boy, usually by a god 2. Daughters taken to become wives 3. Attempt upon a married woman 4. Daughter abducted to become a slave (rape captive); abductor/rapist is human				
<i>Book</i>	<i>Category 1</i>	<i>Category 2</i>	<i>Category 3</i>	<i>Category 4</i>
1	*Daphne, 450–568 Io, 583–746 *Syrinx, 689–712			
2	*Coronis, 572–95 Cornix, 569–80 Callisto, 401–530 Europa, 833–75			
3	Liriope, 339–45			
4	Leucothoe, 226–55 Hermaphroditus, 285–388 Medusa, 793–803	Andromeda, 670–70		
5	*Arethusa, 577–641	Proserpina, 391–96	*Andromeda (Phineus objects to marriage), 8–29	
6	Arachne's tapestry: 103–26 Europa, 103–7 Asterie, 108 Leda, 109 Antiope, 110–11 Danae, 113 Aegina, 113 Mnemosyne, 114 Proserpina, 114 Canace, 115–16 Theophane, 117 Demeter, 118–19 Medusa, 119–20 Melantho, 120 Isse, 122–24 Erigone, 125 Philyra, 126		Alcumena, 112 Iphimedeia/Tyro, 116–17	
		Orithyia, 679–711		Philomela, 455–674

TABLE 6.1. (*continued*)

<i>Book</i>	<i>Category 1</i>	<i>Category 2</i>	<i>Category 3</i>	<i>Category 4</i>
8	Perimele, 592 Mestra, 849–51			
9	Dryope, 331–32 *Lotis, 344–49		*Deianeira, 98–133	
11	Chione, 301–10 *Hesperia, 771–76	Thetis, 221–66		
12	Caenis, 189–203		*Hippodame, 210–458 *Juno [by Ixion], 504–7	
13	*Galatea, 740–897			
14	*Pomona, 634–36, 765–71			

NOTES: An asterisk indicates attempted rape. Category assignments and line citations may be arguable.

Category 2 involves forcibly taking an unmarried girl (or goddess, in the case of Thetis and Proserpina) as a wife. Hades cuts a deal for Proserpina behind Ceres's back; Boreas simply grabs Orithyia; Peleus obeys divine orders, in workmanlike fashion, on the presumption that successful sexual interference with Thetis, under divine sponsorship, will cause her to dwindle into a wife, in the phrase of Congreve's Mrs. Millamant (Fantham [1983b, 26] notes that Peleus is prepared to rape Thetis—"vim parat," *Met.* 11.240).¹² This type of sexual interference evidently holds little interest for Greek myth—unsurprisingly, as married people have few exciting plots, unless they are foolish enough to anger a god. This category of rape ends in domesticity rather than exotic transformation or thrilling punishment, and accordingly it occupies little territory in the *Metamorphoses*. It is, however, a category important to history and to Rome, by way of the tale of the Sabine women.

Category 3, sexual interference with a wife, is usually part of an attempt to break up a marriage or a wedding. Phineus wants his bride back in book 5, and brings on speedy mass murder of the sort not seen again until the cannon makes its appearance in *Orlando Furioso*. Jupiter fools Alcumena, disguised as her husband; Neptune does the same to Iphimedeia (unless, as William Anderson says [1972, ad loc.], Arachne has gotten her myths wrong, and it was Tyro instead). Nessus tries to take back the bride he had hoped to win; the drunken Eurytus sets off a major battle when he tries to steal Hippodame at her wedding to Pirithous.¹³ Even in the magical tales of the Lapiths and Centaurs, of gods disguised as husbands, of the Centaur Nessus attempting to rape the

new bride Deianeira, the rules of human social relations are not violated: the would-be abductor is repelled and destroyed, and the husband retains his bride; the dupe husband whose wife has been impregnated by a major god agrees to put up, although the deed is not exactly kept shut up. For the Romans, this category of sexual interference will recall the rape of Lucretia.

Category 4, daughter converted to slave or rape captive, is unique to the story of Tereus and Philomela, which features careful, methodical plotting, exploitation of social position and family connection (rather than random opportunism, the general pattern for category 1), and imprisonment. This form of rape requires no magic and no disguises, although Tereus engages in considerable dissembling and outright deception. Until the gods transform the three principals into birds, this tale is resolutely human and political, rather than divine and magical.¹⁴ For Roman readers, this story corresponds in significant ways, as I shall argue, to what are at least semihistorical episodes in Roman history: the tales of Philomela and Verginia (Livy, book 2).

CONSEQUENCES, EXPERIENCES, AND THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMATION

Even in Ovid's mythical landscape, we can see familiar human dynamics in place in the responses of the girls' families—dynamics that eventually become the regulations of civic politics in cases of sexual interference. Those dynamics are not uniform. If Perimele's father throws her off a cliff, and Leucothoe's father kills her by live burial,¹⁵ the fathers of Daphne and Io grieve for their daughters' catastrophes, and Agenor, Europa's father, sends her brother Cadmus to find her. In general, the girl interfered with, even by a god, is removed from the normal human traffic of marriage, but even that rule is not inviolate: Dryope, raped by Apollo (in that telltale phrase, "*vimque dei passam*," *Met.* 9.332), was happily married to Andraemon, who was considered fortunate in the match. Her sad end, however, stands in for the kind of punishment that normally befalls humans raped by gods. Such tales amount to a kind of implicit politics: a ruined girl or woman is simply ruined, period.¹⁶

The ruin of a woman who has been raped, or even one on whom a rape attempt was unsuccessful, is enacted persistently in Ovid's astonishing catalogue of mythic rapes, and it is a predictor of the options available to such women in the eventual world of history and politics, the world of Rome at the end of the poem, as discussed below. In its repetitive re-enactment of the way a raped, or almost-raped, female member of the respectable classes (i.e., not a slave) suffers utter destruction, a state of social and personal uselessness in

her community, Greek myth obsessively rehearses the risks to citizen women of both enacting their own choices and being chosen by a more powerful man, without their awareness or their fathers' consent.¹⁷

Ovid's accounts of these girls show their desperate attempts to avoid precisely the predatory male sexuality that ultimately destroys them. Nymphs run, hide, seek to become anything other than beautiful human females: they are willing to give up their lives and their bodies rather than suffer rape.¹⁸ And when they cannot keep from being raped, they may suffer painful, alienating metamorphoses. A tree, a reed, a crow, a pool, a flower—changes that protect girls from rape; an island (Perimele, book 8), a bear and a constellation (Calisto, book 3), a cow (Io, book 1), a man-destroying head (Medusa, book 4)—changes that punish them or protect them from further punishment: these are not members of the human communities in which the girls have grown up. In these elaborate tales of punishment, Ovid points to something fundamental about female bodies in antiquity, namely women's lack of choice when it comes to sex and control of their own lives, and to the insistent belief of mythic men that control of the female body belongs to them.¹⁹

When that belief is solidified into social practice and codified into law, in the world of the Greek *polis* and the Roman *urbs*, it becomes a matter of politics: of the social and civic status of men, of the traffic in women, and even of the status of cities themselves. But before that point, it is a matter of male desire that does not pause to persuade or ask permission. Indeed, such desire usually does not even recognize that permission is relevant and should be sought. Thus, Daphne tells her father that she wants to remain a virgin forever, but even after Peneus assents, Daphne's beauty condemns her hopes, in one of Ovid's most tightly constructed and devastating lines: "te decor iste, quod optas, / esse vetat, votoque tuo tua forma repugnat" ("your very attractiveness forbids what you want; and your beauty fights back against your wishes," *Met.* 1.488–89).²⁰ With this brilliant, logically absurd formulation, Ovid perfectly encapsulates Greek myth's male view of the female body, namely that it does not belong to its inhabitant.

This elliptical formulation must be unpacked. The first half—"te decor iste, quod optas, esse vetat"—means: "men will respond to your attractiveness in a way that will make impossible your hope for virginity." The second half amounts to "the response of men to your beauty will fight back against your wish." Ovid's dense construction amounts to a law of nature: beauty cannot go unused, unenjoyed.²¹ It belongs to the beholder who is strong and daring enough to take it (as Apollo does, permanently, when he claims the laurel

tree). Leo Curran points out that Cornix says of herself “forma mihi nocuit” (2.572), and that Cephalus “pays a compliment, very odd in a context other than the *Metamorphoses*, to his wife,” whom he calls “more worthy of raping” (“dignior ipsa rapi,” 7.697) than her sister Orithyia. These formulations, too, implicitly acknowledge that men will simply grab when they think there are no consequences to their grabbing.²²

Metamorphosis in stories of rape is not limited to victims: gods frequently disguise themselves when they begin their approach.²³ With a married woman, a god tends to use a husband's form, as with Alcumena and Theophane, but for an unmarried female, he frequently puts on a nonhuman costume. Arachne's tapestry—representable in prose or verse alike only by a list—catalogues the absurdities of the disguises used by male gods: for Jupiter, a bull, an eagle, a swan, a satyr, a rain of gold, a flame, a serpent; for Neptune, another bull, a ram, a horse, a bird, a dolphin. For Apollo, a hawk, a lion; for Bacchus, false grapes; for Saturn, a horse. One farmer, two shepherds, and two husbands figure, as well. These disguises highlight the disingenuousness of the gods, who act with simultaneous impulse and calculation—modes that ought ordinarily to be in opposition. Further, the visual field of the tapestry has no regard for chronology or development in the apparently endless tales of rape found in the chaotic universe of Greek myth: Minerva is confronted with a synchronous depiction. The relentless conciseness of the list (*Met.* 6.103–26)—eighteen rapes in twenty-three lines—amounts to a remarkable indictment of these gods:²⁴

Maeonis *elusam* designat imagine tauri
 Europam: verum taurum, freta vera putares;
 ipsa videbatur terras spectare relictas
 et comites clamare suas tactumque vereri
 adsilientis aquae *timidasque* reducere *plantas*.
 fecit et Asterien aquila luctante teneri,
 fecit olorinis Ledam recubare sub alis;
 addidit, ut satyri celatus imagine pulchram
 Iuppiter inplerit gemino Nycteida fetu,
 Amphitryon fuerit, cum te, Tirynthia, *cepit*,
aureus ut Danaen, Asopida *luserit ignis*,
 Mnemosynen pastor, varius Deoida serpens.
 te quoque mutatum torvo, Neptune, iuvenco
 virgine in Aeolia posuit, tu visus Enipeus

gignis Aloidas, aries Bisaltida fallis;
 et te flava comas frugum mitissima mater
sensit equum, sensit volucrem crinita colubris
 mater equi volucris, *sensit delphina* Melantho:
 omnibus his faciemque suam faciemque locorum
 reddidit. est illic agrestis imagine Phoebus,
 utque modo accipitris pennas, modo terga leonis
 gesserit, ut pastor Macareida *luserit* Issen,
 Liber ut Erigonen falsa deceperit uva,
 ut Saturnus equo geminum Chirona crearit.

She designs Europa, *fooled* by the image of the Maeonian bull: you would think the bull and the oceans were real; the girl herself seems to look back at the land behind her and to call on her companions and to fear the touch of the leaping water, and pull back her *fearful feet*. She also made Asterie, held by the struggling eagle, and Leda curling up under the wings of the swan; she adds in how Jupiter, hidden in the image of a satyr, filled Antiope with twin children, and was Amphitryo when he captured you, Alcumena; as a golden rainshower, he fooled Danae, as a shepherd, he *fooled* Mnemosyne; as a spotted snake, Proserpina. She put you, Neptune, transformed into a tawny calf with the Aeolian girl Canace; seeming to be Enipeus, you engendered the Aloidae, you *fooled* Theophane as a ram; the mildest mother of the crops, shining-haired, *felt you as a ram*, Medusa the snake-haired mother of the winged horse *felt you as a bird*, Melantho *felt you as a dolphin*: Arachne rendered his appearance, and the appearance of the places to them all. There's Apollo, in the image of a rustic—she showed how sometimes he carried a bird's wings, sometimes a lion's back; she showed how, as a shepherd, he *tricked* Isse, daughter of Macareus; she showed how Bacchus *fooled* Erigone by disguise as a grape, and how, as a horse, Saturn fathered the double-bodied Chiron.

The list of disguises shows that for the divine rapists, disguise is part of the pleasure they take in rape: gods need not use disguise to avoid consequences, after all. It is as though to use a human form would be boring. Words like *elusam* (103), *luserit* (113, 124), *fallis* (118), and *deceperit* (125) underscore the point that for male gods, rape is a matter of rococo fun and games, and the incestuous rapes of their divine female kin are perhaps especially disturbing.²⁵ No wonder Minerva is enraged at this visual depiction of divine crimes (“caelestia crimina,” 131). Arachne's tapestry amounts to a repetition of the reader's

experience in books 1 through 5—a repetition with brief details and a small amount of overlap. It brings to a close the almost brutally persistent repetition of divine fly-by rape stories, which are much fewer in the remaining nine books of the poem (see table 6.1). The next rape is that of Philomela, a relentlessly dreadful but utterly human tale.

The politics of rape and metamorphosis, then, enacted repetitively across the poem, are that rape victims suffer alienating, dehumanizing metamorphosis in both suffering and escaping rape, but rapists use disguise and deceit in pursuit of women—and that they positively enjoy such dissembling. The animal disguises are absurd, but the human disguises are complex and psychologically disturbing.²⁶ They are free to return to their natural forms once their fun and games are over. But without exception the victims are changed (if only by unsought pregnancy) and often removed from human community. This removal is a personal tragedy, marked in the longing of victim and family to find each other, to be reunited, and in the lasting social and political consequences of rape. In some tales, personal tragedy exercises a large-scale effect.²⁷

RAPE, REPETITION, AND INTERTEXTUALITY

As Roman readers progressed through the poem, they would have seen the Greek mythic pattern fading out, taken over by types of rape that featured significantly in their own legendary foundations. Both recalling and experiencing the poem's declared *telos* ("mea tempora"), they would have been wondering, in the backs of their minds, how Ovid would include the foundational rapes of their own history, rapes that amount to a structure of Rome itself.²⁸ This expectation would have grown greater in book 14. But in describing the early history of Rome, Ovid strictly avoids reference to these famous rapes. He does not avoid Livy's foundational tales—far from it: once he has described the death and deification of Aeneas, he gives a list of rulers, as in Livy: Ascanius, Silvius, Latinus, Epytus, Capys, Capetus, Tiberinus, Remulus, Acrota, Aventinus, Proca (14.609–22).²⁹ After the tale of Pomona and Vertumnus (14.623–771, discussed below), Ovid jumps back into history, in peculiar fashion (14.772–76):

proximus Ausonias iniusti miles Amuli
 rexit opes, Numitorque senex amissa nepotis
 munere regna capit, festisque Palilibus urbis
 moenia conduntur; Tatiusque patresque Sabini
 bella gerunt . . .

Next unjust Amulius ruled the Ausonian kingdom through warfare, and the old man Numitor took back his reign by the gift of his grandsons, and the city's walls were built during the Palilia; Tatius and the Sabine fathers made war.

This absurdly compact and elliptical narrative, both telling and *not* telling things that all Roman readers would have learned before their ABCs, invokes the rapes of Rhea Silvia and the Sabine women, but very obviously does not mention them. The story of the Sabine war takes up some forty lines, and then comes to an abrupt end—again without the actual Sabine women, and without the most dramatic moment of their tale, namely their disruption of the battle (14.800–805):

strata est tellus Romana Sabinis
corporibus strata estque suis, generique cruorem
sanguine cum soceri permiscuit inpius ensis.
pace tamen sisti bellum nec in ultima ferro
decertare placet Tatiumque accedere regno.

The Roman soil was strewn with Sabine bodies and its own bodies, and the unholy sword mixed the blood of father-in-law with son-in-law. Regardless, Tatius decided to stop the war and not to fight it out to the end, and to join the kingdom.

The Sabine women are invoked here, but not mentioned. (If we had only this account, the whole business would be utterly mystifying.) Ovid can use this elliptical narrative because his readers know the story intimately—but they were also extremely familiar with many of the poem's other tales that the poet often tells at length, some of which might well have been painted in their own houses. The ensuing survey of early Roman history, in books 14 and 15, lists several more names and episodes from Livy, including Romulus's apotheosis and various tales of Numa and Egeria. But there is no Rhea Silvia, no Sabine women, no Lucretia; there is especially no Verginia.³⁰

What is the effect of these missing women? In omitting Rhea Silvia and her miraculous twins, Ovid undercuts a crucial etiology for Rome, of the kind he has typically included in the poem: mother of heroes, mother of great city-founders. He also omits Mars, who plays a significant role in the *Fasti*, not least in the narration of his rape of Rhea Silvia. In omitting the Sabine

women, Ovid eliminates the other form of rape myth that offers some sort of retroactive reward or absolution for the crime: abduction-rape that leads to marriage. Again he focuses on the male rulers and agonists of early Rome, rather than on the female victims who had so occupied his attention in the first third of the poem. It is thus crucial to keep in mind that in the *Fasti* he focuses on the women, both representing their feelings (Lucretia, 2.795–802) and letting them speak for themselves (Rhea Silvia, 2.27–38; Hersilia, 3.207–12).

But in the *Metamorphoses* he not only excludes names and stories that his readers would certainly be expecting, but breaks up his narrative of well-known early Roman history with the unusually long story of Pomona and Vertumnus. This story is given a surprising twist at the end, for Ovid's Vertumnus is prepared to rape Pomona, until she falls for his true form: "vimque parat: sed vi non est opus, inque figura / capta dei nympha est et mutua vulnera sensit" (*Met.* 14.770–71).³¹ But for the preceding 150 lines, the story plays with all the elements of various rapes from category 1, as seen throughout the poem (cf. Fantham 1983b, 35), and thus recalls to the Roman reader all the rapes that have preceded this tale, the last "amatory episode" of the poem (Myers 1994b, 225). Here, in *Metamorphoses* 14, in the middle of Ovid's early Roman history, this tale may, as Prudence Jones (2001, 374–75) argues, "substitute for the rape of the Sabines in Ovid's series of legends about Rome in the regal period." But it may also remind the readers of the other foundational Roman rape victims, perhaps particularly because Pomona and Vertumnus are native Italians, not Greeks. And their tale cannot substitute for those other rape stories.

Thus, Rome's famous rape victims are surprisingly absent, at the end of a poem that spends a great—some would say an inordinate—amount of its opening books focused on rape, a poem that ends with a survey of Rome's earliest history, complete with many a quick reference to foundational episodes from Livy. This absence amounts to a conspicuous presence, a blank spot in the reader's experience of the *Metamorphoses*. How would Ovid's readers—many of whom would have read the *Fasti* more or less contemporaneously with the *Metamorphoses*—have reacted? They must have been surprised: after all, if Ovid can fit the Sabine women into his much shorter erotodidactic poem, the *Ars amatoria*, he could easily have accommodated them, along with at least Rhea Silvia and Lucretia, in his capacious *carmen perpetuum*.³²

They are prominent in the *Fasti*, and repetitively so, as table 6.2 shows—with the significant exception of Verginia. Ovid does not avoid repeating tales

between these two poems (and one would not expect such avoidance from a poet who loved to reuse his own materials): alongside the Roman mytho-historical rape victims, the *Fasti* features some notable Greek rape victims from the *Metamorphoses*: Lotis, Io, Callisto, Europa, Philomela, Orithyia, and Persephone.³³

TABLE 6.2. Rapes in the *Fasti*

1. Greek mythic hit-and-run rape of girl or boy, usually by a god 2. Daughters taken to become wives 3. Attempt upon a married woman 4. Daughter abducted to become a slave (rape captive); abductor/rapist is human				
Book	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4
1	*Lotis, 425–37 Juturna, 463–64			
2	Callisto, 153–192 Rhea Silvia, 381–84, 399–404 Juturna, 585–604 Lara, 611–16	Sabine women, 429–34	*Omphale, 303–59 Lucretia, 761–835	
3	Rhea Silvia, 10–40 Io/Isis, 658	Sabine women, 195–214		Philomela, 628–30
4	Rhea Silvia/Ilia, 55–56 Pleiades, 164–78 Sterope, 172 Alcyone, 173 Celaeno, 173 Maia, 174 Electra, 174 Taygete, 174	Persephone, 417–50 Persephone, 590–92		
5	Europa, 603–20	Flora, 183–206 Orithyia, 204	Phoebe & Hilaira, 693–720	
6	Ganymede, 43 Carna/Crane, 125–30 *Vesta, 331–44			

NOTES: An asterisk indicates attempted rape. Bold indicates the women shared between the *Fasti* and Livy. This table includes victims whose rape is not discussed here but is well known (e.g., Juturna, Ganymede). Some categories and line assignments may be debated: note that, for example, Omphale is not exactly Hercules's wife. Uncategorized: Ocesia, *Fasti* 6.25–36 (see n. 33).

Thirty episodes of rape feature in the *Fasti*, with Rhea Silvia and the Sabine women appearing repeatedly.³⁴ No intentional patterning of the rape episodes (or any other) is evident between the two poems.³⁵ We may say all the more, then, that the absence from the *Metamorphoses* of the Roman foundational rape victims is pointed.³⁶ It is thus worth looking a bit more closely at the way in which Ovid presents the stories of early Rome.

OID AND LIVY, RAPE AND ROME

Livy acknowledges that Rome's foundational tales are mythic, taking descent from Greek myth in the person of Aeneas,³⁷ and he periodically notes that certainty is impossible with such ancient materials (1.3) or that his sources overmythologize episodes and events (1.18). But he cannot avoid tales of rape in his early period. He shapes them to fit his themes, aiming especially to de-eroticize the rapes (see Miles 1995, 179–219; Beard 1999).³⁸ Books 1–3 contain one rape, or would-be rape, from each of the categories found in Ovid. The first, that of Rhea Silvia, is a standard god-grabs-girl rape, with the standard resulting miraculous babies. The rape of the Sabine women is presented as a theft, an open abduction, committed not for sexual pleasure but for the serious and proper purpose of marriage. Eventually and famously, the Sabine women give consent, but even Livy does not present them as making an actual free choice. Their consent is coerced, even as Livy shows them to be mollified (*mitigati*, 1.10) by the pleading and sweet talk of Romulus's young men, who appear to be remarkably sophisticated at *blanditiae*. But the girls know that once foreign hands have been laid upon them, they are damaged goods. They can also see that they will not be able to go home instantly in safety. Their acceptance of marriage, in this political scenario, is like that of Leucothoe in *Metamorphoses* 4, Thetis in book 11, Flora in *Fasti* 5: realistically, they have no choice.³⁹

The next category is attempted sexual interference with a wife. Typically these attempts fail. Greek myth cannot tolerate the destruction of a marriage by rape—hence its greatest tale, that of the Trojan War, fought to defend Greek marriage and bring back a single wife. But Roman myth famously contains such a story, in spectacular, foundational fashion. The rape of Lucretia is a calculated assault designed both to take her virtue from her and to destroy her happy marriage. She herself sees suicide as her only option, but her grief, anger, and resentment—her desire for revenge—indicate that nothing in her last twenty-four hours of life was of her own choosing. She codifies the long-standing value that a woman ruined even against her will is useless, no longer

part of her own community—in fact, she serves almost as the foundational hero of that principle, at least in Roman mythology. She must remove herself from her community in order to make that community whole and functional. It is hardly a choice. But it *is* her means of revenge upon the rapist—something rape victims ordinarily cannot achieve in the ancient world.⁴⁰ The rapist Tarquin is punished, as is typical for the mythic pattern, which always ends with the destruction of the would-be thief/rapist of a wife.

The abnormal tale in Livy, then, is the same as in Ovid: category 4, the calculated ruin of a citizen girl who is to be turned into a rape captive. I suggest that Ovid's version of the story of Philomela stands in or substitutes for the story of Verginia, which is pointedly untold in his verse. The historicity of Verginia's tale is not at issue here, but it is worth noting that Livy presents it in specifically Roman, urban, terms: there are decemvirs, shops, a little school for young girls, as well as tribunes, wives, crowds of plebs, a *cliens* and a *patronus*, courts and magistrates, laws, tedious civic bureaucracy, and more. The setting of this story is resolutely historical and political, not mythical or legendary. The juridical details of Verginia's story would resonate with Roman readers in the time of Livy and Ovid, not least because there is a public court, a permanent *quaestio*, dedicated to investigating and punishing sexual delicts under the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*.

Of course, like Daphne, Syrinx, and others, Verginia is not actually raped. But she is reduced to slavery, a form of captivity, and her father uses a penetrative method of murder, which he describes as his only way of saving her (Livy 3.48). In this respect, her father brings us back to Ovid's beginning: as Peneus saved Daphne from rape by converting her into a tree (*Met.* 1.545–52), Verginius saves his daughter from rape by converting her into a corpse. In the world of politics, where Ovid resides, with which his poetry constantly engages, at which he constantly takes jabs, no magical metamorphosis can rescue a victim from a pursuing or calculating rapist. Only death can save or redeem her, regardless of what she herself might want.⁴¹ And Livy's account cannot give a sense that Verginia even gives enforced consent, let alone makes a choice of her own.

Thus, for a reader thinking about Roman foundational rapes, Verginia's nightmarish story hangs over the disturbing, deliberate structure of rape and repetition in the *Metamorphoses*. Those painterly, fantastical rapes, with swans and dolphins, cannot exist in the Rome of Ovid and his readers. We cannot know how often rape of citizens took place in Ovid's Rome (slaves certainly suffered daily rape), but we do know that Rome itself has a special

foundation in raped female bodies, bodies that engendered not so much superhuman heroes as a Republic that had recently come to an end, under a *princeps* who boasted of *res publica restituta*, who himself had abducted a wife (albeit a fairly compliant one), and who managed for decades to keep that fact unspoken, even erased. The Roman near rape of Verginia can have neither reward of foundational offspring nor rescue by magical transformation. It may be too real for Ovid's readers.

PATTERNS OF RAPE IN THE *Metamorphoses*

Seen on a large scale, across the entire poem, Ovid's repetitive, mysterious patterns of rape leave a mark on the reader, ancient or modern, unless the reader chooses a program of strenuous resistance, of interpreting the rapes as insignificant, or as significant in their outcomes rather than in the doing and the being-experienced, so to speak. Such readings have been numerous, perhaps particularly in pictorial art, but they do justice neither to Ovid himself nor to his depicted victims of sexual interference, who suffer fates that they did not choose. The patterns of summarily enacted desire, outbreaks of public violence over women, calculated abduction, systematic steps toward captivity, ought not to be ignored. For Ovid and his Roman readers, I suggest, they point to foundational episodes in Rome's own history, a history that Rome is re-examining in this period, a history that is undergoing official revival, a history grounded in the bodies of women who can, by the assertion of male privilege and force, be converted into symbols and vehicles of Roman politics (see esp. Joplin 1990; Joshel 1992). Such transformation may ultimately contain its own triumphs, in terms of Roman social values, but it is not necessarily something any of those women might have chosen.

Modern readers, especially young women, often find the poem to be a form of assault on themselves. Whether or not they have personally experienced rape, they see young women brutally raped for no reason, and they object. Many a classroom conversation about the poem is taken up with just this subject.⁴² I propose that Ovid's original, and anticipated, readers would have found the repetition of rape in books 1–5, with their reinforcement in Arachne's repetitive tapestry, to be just as dizzying an experience, if for very different reasons. Roman readers would not have approached the poem expecting to identify with girls who happen to be wandering the countryside or the forest. But they knew these tales, and they would have wondered about the order in which Ovid sets them. They would have marveled—sometimes in shock, sometimes in scandalized delight—at the *variatio* with which he

presents the repeated event. They did not fail to notice how front-loaded the poem is with tales of their major male divinities—to whom there were many elaborate, newly built temples in the city—committing just the kinds of *stuprum* that were very publicly illegal under the rule of Augustus. These tales were a source of discomfort to Romans themselves, when they thought of how Romulus plotted and practiced deception (the sort of behavior encapsulated in such words as *elusam*, *fallis*, *luserit*, and *decepit*) in order to take citizen girls from neighboring cities as wives.⁴³ Even reading the poem *seriatim*, Ovid's contemporary readers would have been struck, and driven to thought, by the repetition of Greek rape and the erasure of Roman rape in this most mysterious of epic poems. And in rereading—something they all did—those thoughts might have become increasingly discomfiting.

NOTES

In preparing this chapter, I accrued a number of personal and intellectual debts, and it is a pleasure to acknowledge them here. My first thanks go to my editors, Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover, whose kind invitation to the Langford Conference caused me to set on paper some of the things I had been thinking and teaching for many years. Their insistence on including it in this volume stems either from general graciousness or inexplicable obstinacy, and I thank them regardless. Alison Keith has been a source of constant encouragement and engagement. Katherine R. Simons, Sasha Daly, and Jessica Wise made comments on earlier drafts; conversations with them have been illuminating. My greatest debt is to nearly thirty years' worth of students in undergraduate translation courses. From their powerful reactions to Ovid's beautiful but often alarming *carmen perpetuum*, I have learned more than I can acknowledge. By insisting that an account of rape is never merely technical, a matter of literary technique alone, they taught me not to shy away from the deliberately disturbing sexual politics of the *Metamorphoses*. They have made me a better reader of Ovid.

1. Considering the inclusion, in the *Metamorphoses*, of the physiologically female experience of giving birth, Segal (1998, 28) suggests that Ovid may be writing "with an awareness of an audience of women readers." I have discussed elsewhere both women readers and female readings of Latin poetry, with a focus on Ovid (see James 1997, 2003); here I do not have scope for separate considerations of how female and male Roman readers might respond to the rapes in the *Metamorphoses*, but I would state Segal's point with certainty: particularly given that all but one of the poem's rape victims are women, Ovid knew that women readers were likely to have a different reading of their stories than his male readers would.

2. Ovid's treatment in the *Fasti* of Greek fantastical myth and Roman foundational legend remains incomplete, but the six extant books contain so much relevant,

and insistent, repetition of rape (twenty-six tales) that they must be considered, if only briefly, in this study (see table 6.2). Hejduk (2011, 20–21) notes that rapes in the *Fasti* are often presented in stunningly elliptical or concise fashion, within a single couplet; Arachne's tapestry is similarly concise.

3. Or their ignorance: how many readers knew every one of the obscure myths briefly catalogued in Medea's flight around Greece (*Met.* 7.357–404), or the otherwise unattested rape of Erigone by Bacchus (6.125)?

4. Thus, like Heath (1991, 233n2), I am seeking "to capture the reader's understanding of the *developing* pattern before him/her in order to emphasize Ovid's manipulation of expectations." Heath's reading of Diana's reaction to Actaeon, occurring in book 3, after the rapes of books 1 and 2, is cogent and highly recommended; my approach here is to look at large-scale patterns across the whole poem and describe them in broader strokes. This large-scale goal cannot accommodate the kind of close analysis found in Joplin 1984; Richlin 1992; W. Johnson 1996; James 1997.

5. Even to begin studying patterns of repetition for rape in the *Metamorphoses* raises the obvious problem of chronology. Was Daphne really the *primus amor* of Apollo? Did Jupiter rape Callisto after having raped Io? Such questions could be repeated almost without end, and certainly without answer. The only chronology for the poem's rape stories is in the reader's experience.

6. See Curran 1978, 214: "There are some fifty or so occurrences of forcible rape, attempted rape, or sexual extortion hardly distinguishable from rape." Although they are repeat episodes, I count Arachne's depiction of Europa, Proserpina, and Medusa because it forms part of the reader's experience of episodes of rape in the poem. Overall, I count forty-four separate tales of rape, attempted rape (including Pomona, *Met.* 14.770, because Vertumnus is ready to commit rape), and sexual interference, which includes gods disguised as husbands in order to have sex with mortal women. I list Galatea because she could not "escape the passion of the Cyclops without grief" (13.744–45)—and indeed he pursues her very aggressively.

7. My female pronouns here include Hermaphroditus.

8. As Rozée notes (citing Brownmiller 1975), this distinction dates back to feminist activism in the 1970s. Rozée's work on the subject is anthropologically informed, broader in scale, and more nuanced about how women can appear to consent to an act of sex that they do not actually want and have not chosen. See Rozée 1993, 499–500, 513, with nn. 1–2.

9. If Pomona is an exception because she chooses, ultimately, to have sex with Vertumnus, she has spent much time and effort trying precisely to avoid coercive male desire: "vim tamen agrestum metuens pomaria claudit / intus et accessus prohibet refugitque viriles" (14.635–36). Indeed, as Laurel Fulkerson has reminded me, it is clear that Vertumnus is not ultimately interested in her consent or choice.

10. Curran (1978, 221) remarks, of Leucothoe's submission ("victa nitore dei, posita vim passa querella est," 4.233), "No force or threat of force is present, but the effect

is the same. She recognizes that resistance or demur would be futile." Indeed, she protests to her father that "*ille / vim tulit invitae*" (4.238–39)—where *vis* and *invita* are more or less Ovidian code for rape (as with Vertumnus). It is unfortunately, and unusually, relevant to note here that I personally know quite a few women who reached the same conclusion when confronted by a determined male and were able to see no effective means of resistance.

11. Conversion of the victim into a sign of the god's art may be a form of reward for her, at least in the god's eyes, but it overtly substitutes for rape, exchanging, as it does, forcible sexual possession for another, and eternal, kind of possession. Indeed, it is problematized in the first two examples, when Daphne "seems" to agree (at least in Apollo's eager interpretation), and when Pan physically assumes Syrinx as his instrument.

12. I include Andromeda because Perseus effectively demands her, and her parents can hardly refuse: "*accipiunt legem (quis enim dubitaret?)*," 4.340. She is later called "*pretium et causa laboris*" (4.739), a concise formulation for her passive role in this exchange. See the perceptive remarks of Segal (1998, 20) on "hint[s] of rape" in the first meeting of Perseus and Andromeda.

13. In a final, absurd touch within this category, Monychus boasts that his father, Ixion, had tried to rape Juno (12.504–6).

14. That fact may help to account for Ovid's deliberate grotesqueness here, and the narrator's expression of horror at Tereus's sexual pleasure in the mutilated Philomela (6.561–62). Ovid makes his version more appalling than others appear to have been: his Tereus does not engineer a bigamous marriage to Philomela, but imprisons and brutalizes her.

15. This method was used as recently as 2010 in Turkey, when sixteen-year-old Medine Memi's family suspected that she was talking with boys: see <http://www.smh.com.au/world/girl-buried-alive-by-her-father-and-grandfather-for-befriending-boys-police-20100209-nnlp.html>.

16. The pollution and ruin of the victim may even become contagious: Hermaphroditus and Lotis both infect anyone who touches their transformed bodies. They thus pass on their own punishment to others.

17. Given that any man was likely to be more powerful than any woman, that particular man did not have to be divine. The fact that further suffering and destruction are often visited upon the raped girl by a vindictive goddess—whether a jealous wife or a punitive patroness who cannot punish the rapist who is her own husband, brother, father, or uncle—further demonstrates the complex social structures that bind these girls, as Curran notes (1978, 226). And indeed, as numerous stories from Homer demonstrate, mere abduction can turn a princess into a rape captive/slave, who may suffer brutal, even lethal, punishment by her new owner's wife. The stories from Homer come closer to the world of politics as represented in Roman myth and

to Roman postwar practices of enslaving women and incorporating them into a domestic sphere.

18. Thetis outdoes them all, but even she cannot escape her fate. Her resentful remark "ne . . . sine numine vincis" (11.264) shows her awareness that it took a conspiracy of gods to trap her and place her in Peleus's power.

19. The lack of female sexual choice extends, repeatedly, to a girl's choice *not* to have sex. That is, the *Metamorphoses* shows again and again that women are not allowed to choose celibacy.

20. Translations throughout are mine, and deliberately literal.

21. Hence Daphne's desperate plea to her father to destroy her beauty: "quam nimium placui, mutando perde figuram!" (1.547).

22. The victim's resistance is useless—even testimony to resistance does a girl no good. (Resistance does a goddess no good, either, as the tale of Thetis, besieged by the relentless Peleus, shows; Arachne's web pointedly includes Mnemosyne, Proserpina, and Demeter.) And as Greek myth repeatedly demonstrates, rape is only the beginning of a woman's troubles. Pregnancy, childbirth (always agonizing), and more troubles always follow.

23. Divine metamorphosis has a long history of deployment in all kinds of circumstances, but in the *Metamorphoses* it shows particular features in the matter of rape.

24. Terms describing the male gods and their costumes are underlined; terms for the female victims and their experiences are in italics. I use the Teubner text of W. S. Anderson (1982).

25. It is no accident that Ovid calls Demeter *mitissima* as she is assaulted by Neptune, to remind readers that she does not deserve rape, let alone incestuous rape by her brother. It is also no accident that the outlandish metamorphoses trickle off after books 1–6: Perimele (book 8), Dryope (book 9), and Lotis (book 9) are the poem's last rape victims to lose their human form. See Feldherr's sensitive and thoughtful review of Arachne's web (2002, 174–75). It will be evident here that I do not, with Leach 1974, read Arachne's tapestry as celebrating divine vitality (see also Oliensis 2004, 290–96): I think Minerva reads this artwork correctly. I am particularly persuaded to this view because the tapestry depicts exclusively rapes (which I do not consider "loves of the gods," in the phrase of Leach 1974, 117) that are committed under divine disguise, and because the density of the tapestry's depictions both reflects and intensifies the structure of the poem's pattern of rapes.

26. The disguises can conjure up disturbing prospects, as W. Johnson (1996, 367) notes: "Masquerading as his daughter, goddess of chastity, Jupiter effects the rape of Callisto (Ov. *Met.* 2.424–38); disguised as his victim's mother, Sol initiates the rape of Leucothoe (4.218–320); impersonating an old woman, Apollo ravishes Chione (11.310); and, also in the guise of an old lady, Vertumnus attempts the seduction of Pomona (14.654–766)." See also W. Johnson 1996.

27. One might pause to ask, for instance, what is to happen to the kingdoms of both Athens and Thrace after the tale of Philomela, Procne, and Tereus ends. Similar questions could be multiplied.

28. On rape as a structural element in early Rome, see Joplin 1990; Joshel 1992; Henry and James 2012, 89.

29. As Myers notes (1994a, 113 and n. 83), Ovid's list differs little from the list at Livy 1.3.

30. The Romulus tale gives much attention to his wife, Hersilia—a Sabine woman, and thus an originaive Roman rape victim. But her marital abduction is not mentioned, even though the episode is long enough (14.779–851) to permit it.

31. The phrase “vimque parat,” as noted above, recalls Peleus's approach to Thetis (11.240).

32. It would be easy to object that these tales have no magical transformation. But more than a few stories have no metamorphosis into a *novum corpus*: Medea, Orpheus and Eurydice, and Perseus, to name only a few. As Feldherr (2002, 164) notes, there are tales in which the magical transformation “seems to have little place.” The poem's title notwithstanding, metamorphosis is not needed for the inclusion of a story. Moreover, Lucretia and Verginia *do*, at least in Livy, cause a very particular kind of political metamorphosis. Thanks to Laurel Fulkerson for this remark.

33. The *Fasti* features other tales familiar from Livy, such as that of the evil Tullia (6.587–616) and a peculiar version of Tullius's conception (6.627–36). Ovid certainly expected his readers to be thinking of Livy's early books, both in the *Fasti* and in *Met.* 14–15—where he even plays with the tale, dismissed by Livy, that Numa met and learned from Pythagoras. Ovid includes the rape of Lucretia at length in the *Fasti*, in what Hejduk (2011, 25) rightly describes as “the subject of a rich intertextual dialogue with Livy.”

34. Some of these episodes might indeed be seen as “sexual comedy,” in Fantham's (1983a) term, because they are failed rapes, but even rescue from rape can be, as we have seen, traumatic and alienating. I have not been able to decide if Oresia's impregnation counts as a rape, because Ovid teasingly does not give quite enough information about it. It is certainly an episode of sexual interference, but in a very unclear way.

35. For one thing, the order of business in the *Fasti* is not entirely up to Ovid. That is, he can call Daphne the “*primus amor Phoebi*” if he wants to, and nobody can disprove him. But the mensal calendar controls the chronology, the order, of the *Fasti*. Ovid plays with these elements, as Carole Newlands (1995) has demonstrated, but even so, he must accept certain restrictions. Even if the *Fasti* were complete, we should not expect anything like absolute correspondence between it and the *Metamorphoses*.

36. Sharrock (2002a, 101) remarks on yet another foundational Roman rape victim in the *Fasti*, namely Lara, whose “story of rape and mutilation stands at the

foundation of Roman religion. . . . Her silencing and sexual domination are necessary to the foundation of Roman culture.”

37. He is aware of Vergil's in-progress *Aeneid*, as well.

38. Ovid famously takes a different approach to these tales, in *Ars* 1 and the *Fasti*, by presenting them in the erotically charged meter and lexicon of elegy. In the *Metamorphoses*, however, he focuses instead on other characters—namely men—in engaging with Livy's early books.

39. On this situation, see Scodel 1998 on the captive woman's dilemma.

40. Kaster (2001) discusses the hypothetical rape cases found in Roman *declamationes*, as well as the *lex raptarum*, which allowed raped women to choose the punishment of the men who had raped them. He notes that the topic of rape is “strikingly common” in the declamations (326). Kaster's assessment of rape as creating a “social mess” applies well to the mythic rapes on view in the *Metamorphoses*.

41. There is no reason to think that Lucretia actually wants to die. She sees no other choice, but she is not eager for death.

42. I have written about this subject elsewhere (James 2008), so I do not dwell upon it here; see Kahn 2005 for an eloquent account of such responses. See also James 2014 and especially Thakur 2014.

43. Indeed, in Livy's account of the rape of the Sabine women, the families of the girls call themselves precisely *decepti* (1.9.12)

Metamorphoses in a Cold Climate

PETER E. KNOX

For Ovid, poetry is at once the problem and the solution. In the last book of the *Tristia*, Ovid revisits the question of whether he should go on writing, reproaching the Muses, whose inspiration it was that made him into the author of the *Ars amatoria* (*Tr.* 5.12.45–46): “pace, nouem, vestra liceat dixisse, sorores: / vos estis nostrae maxima causa fugae” (“Let me say, with all due respect, to the nine sisters: you are the principal cause of my exile”).¹ Ovid elaborates on the thought by reference to the offensive work, comparing himself to the craftsman Perillus, who fashioned an iron bull and offered it to the tyrant Phalaris of Acragas for use in torture, and then became the first victim of his own invention (*Tr.* 5.12.47–48): “utque dedit iustas tauri fabricator aeni, / sic ego do poenas Artibus ipse meis” (“And as the maker of the bronze bull paid a just penalty, so I am now paying the penalty for my Arts”). The close connection of Ovid’s fate to that of Perillus is reflected syntactically in the distribution of the epithet *iustas* and the noun it modifies, *poenas*, over the two clauses.² Ovid refers to this story several times in the exile poetry, both earlier in the *Tristia* and again in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*;³ but although there was a well-known earlier version by Callimachus, the operative intertext here is in the latter part of book 1 of the *Ars amatoria*.

The theme of this section is that it is acceptable for men to lie to women for sexual purposes: since women invented perjury, the *praeceptor* comments, it is right that they should be hoisted on their own petard, or roasted in their own bull (*Ars am.* 1.653–56):

et Phalaris tauro violenti membra Perilli
torruit; infelix inbuit auctor opus.
iustus uterque fuit, neque enim lex aequior ulla est
quam necis artifices arte perire sua.

Phalaris, too, roasted the limbs of savage Perillus in his bull; the inventor was the first to inaugurate the unfortunate work. Both men [sc. Busiris, too, mentioned in the preceding lines] were just, for there is no law more fair than that the artisans of death should perish by their own art.

This passage of the *Ars* is densely allusive to the *Aetia* of Callimachus, in which the story of Perillus featured, perhaps prominently, in book 2.⁴ Although the passage in the *Aetia* is fragmentary, enough survives that commentators have been able to note with assurance that for the first readers of the *Ars*, the Callimachean intertext was clearly indicated by specific lexical markers.⁵ But a later reader of the *Ars*, coming to the poem after an encounter with the *Tristia*, would inevitably experience these lines as a proleptic allusion to Ovid's fate in exile. This is signaled by the significant verbal repetition of "arte . . . sua" in "Artibus . . . suis" in *Tristia* 5.12, with an accompanying shift from the general reference to art in the *Ars* to the specific reference to the *Ars amatoria* in the exile poem. At the same time, Ovid shifts the tone to the depreciatory mode of exile by pointedly referring to Perillus, and thus by implication himself, as a *fabricator*, a word belonging to a lower stylistic register,⁶ marking a shift from *artifex* in *Ars* 1.656, the more common, neutral term.⁷ The shift is especially significant when we consider Ovid's programmatic self-fashioning at the opening of the *Ars*: "me Venus artificem tenero praefecit Amori" ("Venus set me as the craftsman in charge of tender Love," 1.7). An early reader of the *Ars* might track the Callimachean intertext, interpreting the passage as an amusing adaptation of a learned etiology to the context of male courtship. Such a reading is, of course, also open to a later reader, but so too is the suggestion that there is a potential risk to the artisan in the creation of any work of art. That suggestion, which is already implicit in Ovid's use of *auctor* for the craftsman, with its obvious potentially literary associations, is now converted to a reading that is authorized by Ovid in the repetition at *Tristia* 5.12.

Ovid's repositioning of his earlier work, especially his amatory elegies, is pervasive in the poetry of exile.⁸ When Ovid remarks in the same poem, "and yet, to confess the truth to you, my Muse / can't be kept from composing poetry" ("nec tamen, ut verum fatear tibi, nostra teneri / a componendo carmine Musa potest," *Tr.* 5.12.59–60), he might just as well have said "recomposing." Repetition, both lexical and thematic, is a distinctive feature of Ovid's poetry from Tomi, where it functions as a means of marking the revision of the earlier work, as does the repetition of Perillus as an exemplum. This is distinct from Ovid's techniques of repetition at the level of the sentence or

phrase,⁹ and represents rather a species of intertextuality. By means of such back-references to earlier work, Ovid sets up a dynamic by which he redirects the reader to a different interpretation, in this case one that implicates Ovid, and not women only, in the earlier text, endowing the mythological reference with a political dimension. This differs from the process as it functions within individual works, the phenomenon that is usually considered under the rubric of “intratextuality,”¹⁰ since it operates across the boundaries established by authors for separate works. And it can be better understood within the context of an original definition of intertextuality in which “each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read,” with the result that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva 1980, 66).

An important feature of the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is Ovid’s rewriting of his earlier poetry, most notably the *Ars amatoria*. As we shall see, the same process is also applied to the *Metamorphoses*. Sergio Casali (2006, 218) has acutely observed that while Ovid had always made a practice of incorporating markers to activate possible readings, even within the *Ars*, the process is most conspicuous within the context of the entire corpus of Ovid’s works: “Ovid wrote the *Ars*, and then he devoted the rest of his poetic career, starting from the sequel itself of the *Ars*, the *Remedia*, to constructing that poem as a poem that has excited Augustus’ anger.”¹¹ This is particularly evident in the exile poetry, where Ovid outlines a new poetics that no longer privileges the source texts that had characterized much of the work of his maturity in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, but instead turns inward. In key programmatic passages of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid relates the aesthetic quality of his exile poetry to the problems posed by not having access to suitable sources in earlier literature. Here again, in the same poem from the *Tristia*, Ovid laments the lack of a library in Tomi (5.12.51–54):¹²

at, puto, si demens studium fatale retemptem,
 hic mihi praebebit carminis arma locus?
 non liber hic ullus, non qui mihi commodet aurem,
 verbaque significant quid mea, norit, adest.

And if I’m mad enough to reattempt my fatal pastime, do I imagine this place will offer me equipment for my song? There’s not a single book here, no one to lend me an ear, or who could know what my words mean.

Ovid may—or may not—be exaggerating the poverty of the Tomitan library scene, but he is also signaling an important shift in the intertextual focus of his work away from earlier Latin and Hellenistic poetry. The most important intertext in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is the poet's own experience and, with that, his own work, as Ovid refocuses his earlier career from the perspective of exile.¹³ Verbal repetition is the definitive marker of this type of revision, although it is the context of the repetition that determines whether or not it represents an alteration of the perspective of the earlier work. Repetition of individual words or phrases may or may not be significant, depending upon the memorability of the context thus evoked.¹⁴ In other words, the stories matter. When Ovid revises the reading of a narrative in the *Metamorphoses*, the revision is effective *both* because the first telling in the hexameter narrative poem has a distinctive effect *and* because his repetition of the story in the exile poetry is accompanied by clear verbal markers that appear in a distinctive setting.¹⁵ Let us consider two examples.

THROW ANOTHER LOG ON THE FIRE (AGAIN)

By repeating stories of transformation from the *Metamorphoses* in the exile poetry as an expression of his own experience, Ovid also activates new readings of those stories in their original context. Imagine yourself among the first readers of Ovid's eighth book of the *Metamorphoses*, before the first ship from Tomi has docked at Ostia, bearing the first roll of the *Tristia*. It is likely that you would read the story of Althaea's burning of the fateful log that will cause her own son's death as representing the internal struggle between her competing sympathies for the deaths of her brothers and the life of her son.¹⁶ And yet other readings are possible (*Met.* 8.473–78):

Thestias haud aliter dubiis adfectibus errat
 inque vices ponit positamque resuscitat iram.
 incipit esse tamen melior germana parente
 et, consanguineas ut sanguine leniat umbras,
 impietate pia est. nam postquam pestifer ignis
 convaluit, “rogus iste cremet mea viscera” dixit.

So Thestius's daughter wavers between uncertain emotions, setting aside her anger, only to revive it in turn. But the sister in her becomes stronger than the parent, and, to appease the ghosts of her blood with blood, impiety makes her

pious. For when the deadly fire grew strong, she said, “May that funeral pyre consume the flesh of my flesh.”

As more than one critic has observed,¹⁷ there are an abundance of lexical items in this episode of the *Metamorphoses* that might trigger a reading that goes beyond the immediate narrative to include a broader literary context. In this passage we see how the sister’s emotions overwhelm the parent’s, but this emotional struggle is developed throughout the episode as a lexical conflict as well. Althaea struggles with the *nomina* that pull her in different directions—is she *mater* or *soror*? (*Met.* 8.463–64): “pugnant materque sororque / et diversa trahunt unum duo nomina pectus” (“mother and sister are in conflict, and the two names pulled a single heart in different directions”). The claims of the sister win out, but Ovid consistently underlines how word choice conditions this decision as well as mirrors it.¹⁸ His use of the patronymic *Thestias* to refer to Althaea is not conditioned by metrical convenience, but underscores the tragic paradox of how this parent will now deal with her own child.¹⁹ The body of her son, Meleager, is denoted in a phrase that is striking in this context: “mea viscera” (8.478).²⁰ Ovid’s lexical choice in this part of the story focuses the reader’s response upon the status of the son as a part of the parent, and opens the possibility of a reading of the story as a metaphor for negation of the creative act.

But it is Ovid who activates this reading by his subsequent rewriting of the episode in exile. You are now a reader of that first roll of the *Tristia* sometime later in the decade of the teens CE, unrolling to the seventh poem, addressed to an anonymous friend who keeps a portrait of Ovid (*Tr.* 1.7.15–22):

grata tua est pietas, sed carmina maior imago
 sunt mea, quae mando qualiacumque legas,
 carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas,
 infelix domini quod fuga rupit opus.
 haec ego discedens, sicut bene multa meorum,
 ipse mea posui maestus in igne manu.
 utque cremasse suum fertur sub stipite natum
Thestias et melior matre fuisse soror,
 sic ego non meritos mecum peritura libellos
 imposui rapidis viscera nostra rogis.

Your devotion is welcome, but my poems are a larger portrait, and these I bid you read, such as they are—the poems that tell of the changed forms of

men, the work cut short by its owner's unhappy exile. These verses, upon my departure, like so many of mine, I sadly placed in the fire with my own hand. And just as Thestius's daughter, so the story goes, burned her own son in burning the log and proved a better sister than mother, so I placed my innocent books, flesh of my flesh, doomed to perish with me, upon the raging pyre.

The ostensible subject is the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid's own creation, evoked by verbal repetitions—"carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas"—which Ovid had considered burning, a gesture toward the traditions about the *Aeneid* that he redirects to his own work. This point is underscored by the comparison to Althaea and Meleager, where verbal repetitions underscore that the *Metamorphoses* is still the subject, marking the eighth book as the operative intertext here. But when next you unroll that book, the story of Althaea has been transformed by its own new intertext in the *Tristia*. What is presented as a simile in the exile poetry, comparing Ovid to Althaea, has been transformed into a clearly pointed metaphor in the *Metamorphoses*, in which Althaea may be read as figuring Ovid. Althaea, who kills her own child, in turn owes her own suicide to that act. The effect is similar to the reconfiguration of the exemplum of Perillus in the *Ars* discussed above, reflecting a consistent preoccupation in the exile poetry with the ways in which the creative act can in fact be destructive.

WHAT ACTAEON SAW (AGAIN)

Ovid's exilic reconfiguration of the story of Althaea sends us back to the *Metamorphoses*, and in the process generates new intertextualities there. He does this elsewhere in the exile poetry, sometimes quite poignantly, as in his evocation of the story of Actaeon in the third book of the *Metamorphoses*. It has often been suggested that the *Metamorphoses* underwent revision in the last years of Ovid's life, while he was in exile at Tomi.²¹ One of the principal exhibits in this line of argument is the preamble to the story of Actaeon, which makes a link to the story of Cadmus, apostrophized here as Ovid offers some authorial commentary (*Met.* 3.138–42):

prima nepos inter tot res tibi, Cadme, secundas
causa fuit luctus alienaque cornua fronti
addita vosque, canes, satiatæ sanguine erili.
at bene si quaeras, Fortunæ crimen in illo,
non scelus invenies; quod enim scelus error habebat?

In the midst of so much prosperity, Cadmus, your grandson was your first reason to mourn, with strange antlers sprouted from his brow and his dogs slaking their thirst in their master's blood. But if you make careful inquiry, you will find grounds to accuse Fortune. No crime was committed; for what crime is there in a mistake?

The occurrence here of the language that Ovid would later use in his exile poetry to refer to the grounds for his exile is what has led some critics to question the chronology. *Error* is the term that Ovid makes into a leitmotif for his offence against the emperor, most famously in his epistle to the emperor referring to "a poem and a mistake" (*Tr.* 2.207).²² And in more than one instance he makes the same contrast between a "mistake," *error*, and a "crime," *scelus*, as here in book 4 of the *Tristia*, where he describes his continuing relationship with his Muse, even on the journey into exile (4.1.19–24):

me quoque Musa levat Ponti loca iussa petentem:
 sola comes nostrae perstitit illa fugae;
 sola nec insidias, Sinti nec militis ensem,
 nec mare nec ventos barbariamque timet.
 scit quoque, cum perii, quis me deceperit error,
 et culpam in facto, non scelus, esse meo.

The Muse comforted me too, as I sought the appointed lands of Pontus: she alone was the steadfast companion of my exile, she alone feared no ambush, nor the Sintian soldier's sword, nor the sea and the winds and the land of the barbarians. She knows also what mistake deceived me when I was ruined, and she knows that there was offense in my deed, but no crime.

It is extremely unlikely for a number of reasons that Ovid revised the *Metamorphoses* after leaving Rome, not least because it is the most uneconomical explanation of the coincidences between the narrative poem and the exile poetry. However, in *Tristia* 1.7 Ovid explicitly announces one revision of the *Metamorphoses* that would transform the entire poem without altering a word of it by supplying a new preface (1.7.33–40):

hos quoque sex versus, in primi²³ fronte libelli
 si praeponendos esse putabis, habe:
 "orba parente suo quicumque volumina tangis,

his saltem uestra detur in urbe locus.
 quoque magis faveas, haec non sunt edita ab ipso,
 sed quasi de domini funere rapta sui.
 quicquid in his igitur vitii rude carmen habebit,
 emendaturus, si licuisset, eram.”

And here are six verses, to be placed at the front of the first book, if you think that appropriate: “All you who touch these rolls, now orphaned of their parent, at least let a place in the city be given to them. They were not published by him, and so you may give them the more support; rather, they were, so to speak, snatched from their master’s funeral. And so whatever flaws this unfinished poem contains, I would have emended if I had had the chance.”

The new preface converts the *Metamorphoses* at a stroke to a work of exile, thus licensing readers to import the later poetry as intertexts to contribute to their interpretations.²⁴ The last couplet of this new preface supplies the rationale: the *Metamorphoses* is represented as unfinished (*rude*), leaving open the possibility of emendation. But the poet himself did not have the opportunity—the last word of the new preface in the first person singular is decisive²⁵—leaving open interpretative possibilities for his readers.

Ovid’s characterization in the exile poetry of the grounds for his punishment thus supplies an important intertext *ex post facto* for reading the Actaeon episode in book 3 of the *Metamorphoses* as a metaphor for his experience. The memorability of his references to *crimen*, *carmen*, and *error* in the exile poetry is sufficient to activate that interpretation, but in the long elegiac epistle to Augustus that makes up the second book of the *Tristia*, Ovid is explicit in marking the intertextual relationship (2.103–8):

cur aliquid vidi? cur noxia lumina feci?
 cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi?
 inscius Actaeon vidit sine veste Dianam:
 praeda fuit canibus non minus ille suis.
 scilicet in superis etiam Fortuna luenda est,
 nec veniam laeso numine casus habet.

Why did I see something? Why did I make my eyes guilty? Why experience an offense without knowing it? Unwittingly Actaeon saw Diana unclothed: nonetheless he became the prey of his own hounds. Evidently, among the

gods even *Fortune* must be expiated, nor is accident an excuse when a divinity has been offended.

The repetition of *Fortuna* in this context clearly points to the earlier passage in the *Metamorphoses* (3.141) and makes it certain that a reader competent in Ovid would inevitably note the reflexive intertext in the exile poetry when reading the earlier poem.²⁶ To the naïve first reader, with as yet no familiarity with the *Tristia*, the story of Actaeon in the *Metamorphoses* is a parable of the irrational consequences for mortals who come in conflict with the divine; but for the informed reader who now knows Ovid's refashioning in the *Tristia*, it is a metaphor for the injustice that attends unchecked power. It can only be read now as an implied criticism of the emperor.²⁷

AUGUSTUS, YOU WERE ALWAYS ON MY MIND

Just as he rewrites himself into the narrative of the *Metamorphoses* through reflexive allusions in the *Tristia*, Ovid refashions the emperor's appearances in the earlier poem. More than one critic has attempted to show that the *Metamorphoses*, as well as the *Ars*, was implied in the charge against Ovid's *carmen*. Most notoriously, Sven Lundström (1980) finds Augustus lurking behind every appearance of Jupiter and every evil king or capricious god in the *Metamorphoses*, arguing that he was so sophisticated a reader that he detected this and sent Ovid to the Black Sea out of pique.²⁸ This scenario is implausible, at least for Augustus's first reading of the *Metamorphoses*, not least because by 8 CE Augustus had not read the *Tristia*, in which Ovid himself activates such readings retroactively.

But Lundström is not the only critic to see in the next passage a covert allusion to the capriciousness of the punishment meted out by the emperor (see Kenney 1982, 444n1). Cycnus, friend and relative of Phaethon, has joined his sisters in lamentation by the banks of the Eridanus, to witness their transformation into poplars and be transformed himself into a swan (*Met.* 2.377–80):

fit nova Cycnus avis nec se caeloque Iovique
 credit, ut iniuste missi memor ignis ab illo;
 stagna petit patulosque lacus ignemque perosus
 quae colat elegit contraria flumina flammis.

Cycnus becomes a new bird, but he doesn't entrust himself to the sky and to Jupiter, since he recalls the fire unjustly launched by him. He seeks out the

pools and open lakes; and abhorring fire, he chose to inhabit the waters, as the opposite of flame.

Ovid compares his exile to a thunderbolt from Jove so often—in over thirty of the fifty-one poems that make up the *Tristia*—that the suggestion of a reference to Augustus gains retroactive traction here.²⁹ Even to the pre-exilic reader, the passage would be striking, not only for the unusual editorial intervention in which the poet criticizes Jupiter,³⁰ but also for the language in which that criticism is expressed: the adverb *iniuste* would draw notice from an ancient reader as belonging to the neutral register of diction and not common in poetry.³¹ At its first reading the story of Phaethon may thus be interpreted as offering an example of a mortal who blamelessly falls victim to an unjustified act of violence, but it is also susceptible of a deeper level of interpretation that figures Augustus as Jupiter.

Such a reading might already be authorized within the *Metamorphoses* in book 1, when Ovid compares the homes of the gods on Olympus to the residence of Augustus on the Palatine (1.174–75):³² “hic locus est quem, si uerbis audacia detur, / haud timeam magni dixisse Palatia caeli” (“this is the place which, if I may be so bold as to say it, I’d not be afraid to term the Palatine of great heaven”). The equation of Jupiter with Augustus in the remainder of the poem is opened as a possibility here, although it would be a questionable proposition if the relegation of Ovid had never taken place.³³ But writing from Tomi, Ovid definitively converts the theme of the randomness of divine power to his own situation when he directs his new book of poetry to avoid treading on the Palatine Hill. Ovid repeats his earlier representation of the Palatine as a kind of Olympus, but this time it is the place from which Augustus launched his thunderbolt against the poet (*Tr.* 1.1.69–72):

forsitan expectes, an in alta Palatia missum
 scandere te iubeam Caesareamque domum.
 ignoscant augusta mihi loca dique locorum!
 venit in hoc illa fulmen ab arce caput.
 esse quidem memini mitissima sedibus illis
 numina, sed timeo qui nocuere deos.

Perhaps you are waiting to see if I’d send you to the lofty Palatine and tell you to climb to Caesar’s house. May those august places and the gods of those

places forgive me! It was from that citadel that the thunderbolt fell upon this head of mine. There are, I know, in those shrines *deities of great mercy, but I fear the gods who did me harm.*

The possibility of reinterpreting the story of Phaethon as a figure of the ambitious artist felled by an unjust power is then explicitly opened in the following lines (1.1.79–82):

vitaret caelum Phaethon, si viveret, et quos
optarat stulte, tangere nollet equos.
me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma timere:
me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.

Phaethon would avoid the sky, were he still alive, nor would he want to touch those horses he'd stupidly wished for. I admit that I too fear Jupiter's weapons, which I have felt: whenever it thunders, I imagine that I'm the target of a hostile bolt.

If the first readers of the *Metamorphoses* read the story of Phaethon as depicting the death of an innocent at the hands of a cruel divine power, that interpretation acquired new depth and poignancy after Ovid had signaled his own identification with the victim.³⁴ In the *Metamorphoses* the fire from Jupiter that kills Phaethon is called "savage" ("saevis . . . ignibus," 2.313)—an epithet that is not applied casually by Ovid.³⁵ How much more striking is it after Ovid's identification of Augustus with the thunderbolt in the *Tristia*?

EPILOGUE

In reviewing patterns of repetition in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, it is best to consider Ovid's poetics of exile as in a dynamic process of development rather than as a static phenomenon: Ovid did not board the ship to Tomi with a plan for how he would prosecute his writing career from that point. At least five phases in this development can be discerned.³⁶ Three of them can be assigned to the *Tristia*, where, in books 1 and 2, Ovid may be seen as reasserting the poetic values of his earlier career. In *Tristia* 3 and 4, the second phase of his development in exile, we begin to see Ovid characterize his poetry in terms of decline, a development that is more clearly reflected in the third and final phase of the *Tristia*, in the last book, where Ovid's characterization of his exile poetry begins to take on the outlines that distinguish

the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In this context the opening poem in *Tristia* 5 is programmatic; and it is a reasonable assumption that, like other proems, it was the last poem to be composed, thus drawing it even closer to the orbit of the *ex Ponto*. The subject of his exile poetry is announced here, as Ovid gradually came to conceive of it—himself: “sum . . . argumenti conditor ipse mei” (“I am myself the author of my own narrative,” *Tr.* 5.1.10).³⁷ A persona perhaps, like the poet-lover of *Amores* 1.1, but this time without the vast tradition of Roman and Hellenistic poetry as a point of reference. Instead, Ovid is intent on refashioning the image of himself. This extends to the conclusion of the *Metamorphoses*, for which he supplies a new focus.

The epilogue stands as Ovid’s statement of his creative independence and an assertion of the enduring qualities of his art. For the reader who does not know Ovid’s fate or the poetry from exile, it is without irony or subtext; those are supplied by the revisions Ovid sends back from the Black Sea. Without that background Jupiter’s wrath can be read as a generic expression of irrational and inexplicable power (*Met.* 15.871–79):

iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis
nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.
cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius
ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi;
parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum;
quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris
ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama
(si quid habent veri vatum praesagia) vivam.

And now I have finished my work, which neither Jupiter’s wrath, nor fire or sword, nor devouring time can destroy. Come when it will, that day which has power over nothing but this body of mine may put an end to the uncertain span of my life. But with the better part of myself I shall forever be borne above the stars, and my name shall be indelible. Wherever the might of Rome extends in the lands she conquered, I shall be read and recited by the people, and through all the ages, if the prophecies of poets have any truth in them, in fame I shall live.

This is not to say that it would not have been possible to include Augustus among the irrational powers for which Jupiter here stands as emblem.³⁸ But it

becomes virtually impossible to read the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses* in any other way once Ovid has rewritten it in the *Tristia* (3.7.45–54):

en ego, cum caream patria vobisque domoque,
 raptaque sint, adimi quae potuere mihi,
 ingenio tamen ipse meo comitorque fruorque:
 Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil.
 quilibet hanc saevo vitam mihi finiat ense,
 me tamen extincto fama superstes erit,
 dumque suis victrix septem de montibus orbem
 prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.
 tu quoque, quam studii maneat felicius usus,
 effuge venturos, qua potes, usque rogos!

Look at me—though I’ve lost my native land, you, and my home, and I’m bereft of everything that could be taken from me, yet my intellect is my companion and my joy: over this Caesar could have no rights. Should someone end my life with a savage’s sword, still my fame will survive me when I’m dead, and while in triumph Mars’s Rome from her seven hills surveys a conquered world, I shall be read. You too—though I pray that a happier use of your inspiration awaits you—evade that eventual funeral pyre, in whatever way you can.

Repetitions of themes such as the random and unpredictable end of the poet’s life—“quilibet hanc saevo vitam mihi finiat ense” in line 49 picks up “cum volet, illa dies . . . incerti spatium mihi finiat aevum” in the epilogue—activate the intertext in the *Metamorphoses*, which is then present to the mind when Ovid again asserts that he shall be read as long as Rome rules the world—that is, for eternity. It becomes impossible to read the epilogue of the *Metamorphoses* without interpolating Augustus into the text from this passage in the *Tristia*: it is not Jupiter’s wrath that is at issue, but Caesar’s—“Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil.”

The claim is no less potent in Ovid’s second rewriting of the epilogue in his poetic autobiography (*Tr.* 4.10), even though Augustus’s presence is not explicit and Ovid refers instead to Envy (*Livor*, 4.10.123) as the antagonist. In concluding with an address to his Muse as his sole source of consolation, however, Ovid forcefully underscores the message that his art will overcome the hostile forces ranged against him because of the reception of his work (*Tr.* 4.10.125–32):

nam tulerint magnos cum saecula nostra poetas,
 non fuit ingenio Fama maligna meo.
 cumque ego praeponam multos mihi, non minor illis
 dicor et in toto plurimus orbe legor.
 si quid habent igitur vatum praesagia veri,
 protinus ut moriar, non ero, terra, tuus.
 sive favore tuli, siue hanc ego carmine famam,
 iure tibi grates, candide lector, ago.

For although our age has produced great poets, Fame has not been ill-disposed to my talent. Although I rank many above me, I am not less quoted than they are and I am the most read in the entire world. So if the prophecies of poets have any truth in them, should I die right now, I will not belong entirely to the earth. Whether I have gained this fame through favor or poetry, by rights it is you, honest reader, I thank.

Ovid signals the revision through verbal repetition—line 129 (“si quid habent igitur vatum praesagia veri”) is taken verbatim from the epilogue of the *Metamorphoses*, so the point is not missed. Augustus is present in this poem only by implication, and as a negative force, *Livor*. In the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid predicted widespread popularity for his poem among ordinary people throughout the Roman world: “quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris, / ore legar populi” (“Wherever the might of Rome extends in the conquered lands, I shall be read and recited by the people,” *Met.* 15.877–78). Critics should attach more weight to Ovid’s choice of the word *populus* as evidence that, in contrast to many of his contemporaries, Ovid appealed to a wide readership, not a select few.³⁹ The contrast with the pose adopted by Ovid’s earlier contemporaries—for example, Horace’s “odi profanum vulgus” (“I hate the common mob,” *Carm.* 3.1.1) or Propertius’s “indocti semita vulgi” (“the path of the uneducated mob,” 2.23.1)—is striking. Ovid repeatedly insists upon this broad readership, as at *Tristia* 3.14.23–24, remarking on the allegedly unfinished state of the *Metamorphoses*: “nunc incorrectum populi pervenit in ora, / in populi quicquam si tamen ore meum est” (“now it reaches the lips of the people uncorrected, that is, if any work of mine is on the people’s lips”). That claim is now underscored in his poetic autobiography in the *Tristia* (“in toto plurimus orbe legor,” “I am the most read in the entire world,” 4.10.128), just as he is also redirecting his reader to supply an Augustan persona for Jupiter. The contrast between himself as a popular poet and Augustus as

indiscriminate tyrant is particularly important for Ovid's revision of the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*.

When Ovid composed the first book of the *Tristia*, he imagined himself as an addition to his earlier masterpiece, the *Metamorphoses*. His own condition was so changed that it deserved to be included in the hexameter narrative poem (*Tr.* 1.1.117–20):

sunt quoque mutatae, ter quinque volumina, formae,
 nuper ab exequiis carmina rapta meis.
 his mando dicas, inter mutata referri
 fortunae vultum corpora posse meae.

There are also the changed forms, three times five rolls, recently snatched from my exequies. To them I bid you say that the face of my fortune can be reckoned among those changed bodies.

Whatever the circumstances of Ovid's relegation,⁴⁰ and whatever the role played in it by a *carmen*, the *Tristia* constitutes a prolonged meditation on the role of poetry in Ovid's life, with a particular emphasis on reorienting the readers' approach to the *Ars* and the *Metamorphoses*. But Ovid's perspective on his life and his art did not remain static during his time in Tomi, and while shifts of emphasis are discernible within the *Tristia*, they are even more evident in the transition from the *Tristia* to the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In repeating themes from the *Metamorphoses* in the later collection of elegies, Ovid is less concerned with the reception of his earlier poetry, less focused on representing Augustus as a tyrant, and more inclined to reflect on the possibility of change as a release from suffering than as a form of punishment. The passage of time played a role in this development, as we see in the opening book of the *Epistulae*, for Ovid was no longer a newcomer in Tomi (*Pont.* 1.2.25–28):

hic me pugnantem cum frigore cumque sagittis
 cumque meo fato quarta fatigat hiems.
 fine carent lacrimae, nisi cum stupor obstitit illis,
 et similis morti pectora torpor habet.

Here I am, fighting with the cold, with arrows, with my own fate, exhausted by a fourth winter. My tears have no end, except when blocked by dullness and a paralysis like death takes hold of my heart.

Ovid no longer figures himself as a victim from the *Metamorphoses*, an innocent like Actaeon or Phaethon unjustly struck by Jupiter's thunderbolt; instead, he wishes only for a moment of transformation as a release from pain (*Pont.* 1.2.29–32), as one was granted Niobe (not Actaeon) and the Heliades (not Phaethon):

felicem Nioben, quamvis tot funera vidit!
 quae posuit sensum saxea facta mali.
 vos quoque felices, quarum clamantia fratrem
 cortice velavit populus ora novo.

Happy Niobe, though she saw so many deaths! For she lost the sensation of pain when turned to stone. Happy you too, whose lips the poplar clothed in new bark, while still calling for your brother.

But this is a transformation that is denied to Ovid (*Pont.* 1.2.33–34): “ille ego sum, lignum qui non admittor in ullum; / ille ego sum, frustra qui lapis esse velim” (“I am the one not granted admission into timber”). The couplet has an air of finality appropriate to a funerary epitaph,⁴¹ and the repetition of “ille ego” is emphatic.⁴² The ironies inherent in Ovid's expressing his wish to become a stone in language appropriate to an epitaph would not have been lost on a Roman reader. As important as it was for Ovid to reposition the experience of the *Metamorphoses* through retroactive revision in the *Tristia*, identifying himself with his greatest masterpiece, it is an option that he relinquishes in the *ex Ponto*, with the realization that metamorphosis can no longer be repeated in his case, even as an act of the imagination.

NOTES

1. Critics have been less interested in the relationship of this poem to Ovid's earlier work, but see Martelli 2013, 179–83. For an assessment of this poem's place within Ovid's exilic corpus and, in particular, its intertextual resonances with Catullus's poetic epistles 65 and 62, see Gareth Williams 1994, 55–59. Quotations of Latin texts are from the following editions: Tarrant 2004 (*Metamorphoses*), and Owen 1915 (*Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*). All translations are my own.

2. Cf. Luck 1977, ad loc., and for further illustrations of this word order, cf. Housman 1903 on Manil. *Astr.* 1.270.

3. *Tr.* 3.11.39–54, 5.1.53–54; *Pont.* 2.9.44, 3.6.42; cf. also *Ibis* 435–38.

4. Cf. fr. 44–47 Harder (= 44–47 Pf.). For detailed discussion, see Harder 2012, 2:369–78. Harder's edition includes *SH* 252, whose publication in 1976 as *PSorb. inv.*

2248 opened the possibility that Callimachus's treatment consisted of more than a brief reference; cf. also Hollis 1977, 154. There are some grounds for speculation that the episode was featured toward the end of book 2, with links both to the opening of the book and the beginning of *Aetia* 1: cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons 1983, 99; Harder 2012, 372–73.

5. In the Ovidian passage the reference to Perillus and Phalaris occurs in conjunction with mention of Busiris, as it does in the *Aetia*. Fr. 44 Harder, Αἴγυπτος προπάροιθεν ἐπ' ἑννέα κάρφετο ποίας ("in earlier times Egypt suffered from drought for nine years"), is a reference to Busiris, which is imitated fairly closely in *Ars* 1.647–48, "dicitur Aegyptus caruisse iuvantibus arua / imbribus atque annos sicca fuisse novem" ("it is said that Egypt had been parched for nine years without field-nurturing rains"), where the "footnote" marker *dicitur* (on which see Hinds 1998, 1–5) clearly points to Callimachus; cf. Hollis 1977, ad loc. The otherwise somewhat obscure reference to Phalaris (and Busiris) as "just" in 655 acquires point if the testimonium to Callimachus's account in Pseudo-Plutarch (*Parall. min.* 39A p. 315C = fr. 47 Harder) accurately reflects the treatment in the *Aetia*, ironically characterizing Phalaris as ὁ δὲ τότε μόνον γενόμενος δίκαιος after ordering Perillus's death. A further indicator: the inventor of Phalaris's bull is consistently called Perilaus in the Greek sources other than Callim. fr. 47 Harder, where his name is Perillus, as it is consistently in Latin authors.

6. It is rare in literature of the classical period, even in prose, attested only once in Lucretius, Manilius, and Vergil, and only twice in Ovid (here and *Met.* 1.57), but it is quite common in later Latin and Christian authors; cf. *TLL* s.v. Substantives in *-tor* are quite common in contexts featuring more popular Latin; cf. Cooper 1895, 58–70. Ovid may have been recalling Vergil's striking use of the word to characterize Epeus, the builder of the Trojan Horse, as *doli fabricator* ("fabricator of the deception"), which combines the low term with an unusual metaphor.

7. For the concept of "neutrality" in levels of diction, cf. Powell 1999, 324–25.

8. Cf. P. Miller 2004, 211: "The exilic poetry does not abandon the subject position of amatory elegy but recasts it."

9. See Wills 1996, especially 161–63, 213–16, 228–30, 316–25.

10. For discussion of the term, its history, and its interpretative implications, see Sharrock 2000, 4n8 and her discussion at 5–13. In the same volume Newlands (2000) offers a lucid demonstration of the process at work in the *Fasti*.

11. This aspect of Ovid's performance is the recurring theme of Martelli 2013.

12. Cf. *Tr.* 3.14.37–38: "non hic librorum, per quos inuiter alarque, / copia: pro libris arcus et arma sonant" ("here I do not have a supply of books to entice me or to sustain me: instead of books there is the rattle of bows and armor"). Ovid redeploys a motif from Catullus 68.33–34; cf. Gareth Williams 1994, 55–56.

13. On this aspect of Ovid's poetics in exile, cf. Tarrant 2002, 29–31.

14. Repetition of individual words or phrases is, of course, one of the hallmarks of Ovid's verbal style, catalogued in such works as Lueneburg 1888; Ganzemüller 1911.

The importance of “memorability” in assessing the processes of intertextuality was underlined by Conte 1986, 35–36, although its significance has not always been recognized; cf. Boyd 2000b, 27.

15. Such repetitions are briefly acknowledged by Lueneburg 1888, 72–73.

16. This line of interpretation is succinctly put by Galasso 2000, 1171: “Il principale interesse di Ovidio è concentrato su questa alternativa, che gli consente di analizzare la coscienza di una donna in preda alla passione in un modo diverso rispetto a Medea e Scilla.”

17. E.g., Hinds 1985, 21–24, with perceptive comments on the relationship of this passage to *Tr.* 1.7; cf. also Hardie 2002, 242–45.

18. Cf. *Met.* 8.506–8: “et cupio et nequeo. quid agam? modo vulnera fratrum / ante oculos mihi sunt et tantae caedis imago, / nunc animum pietas maternaque nomina frangunt” (“I desire it and yet I cannot do it. What am I to do? At one moment, my brothers’ wounds appear before my eyes and a vision of all that slaughter, but at another, my sense of obligation and the fact that I am called ‘mother’ break my spirit”). And see Hardie 2002, 243–44, on the thematic importance of *nomina* here.

19. Cf. Galasso 2000, 1172, on the significance of the patronymic here. The patronymic is not used by any other Latin poets, other than Lucilius to refer to Leda (1.25 Marx). Althaea’s brothers are consistently, and significantly, called by the patronymic *Thestiadae* throughout the episode (*Met.* 8.304, 434), while Althaea is named only in a poignant juxtaposition when they are dead: “cum videt extinctos fratres Althaea referri” (“when *Althaea* sees her dead brothers being carried back,” *Met.* 8.446).

20. For the sense “flesh of my flesh,” cf. 6.651, *OLD* s.v. *viscus* 5. This is anticipated in the wordplay in line 476, where *sanguine* plays on the meaning “offspring” or “descendant”; cf. Gilchrist 1989.

21. An argument first made forcefully by Pohlenz (1913, 11); cf. Kenney 1982, 444n1: “It is possible that our text of the *Metamorphoses* goes back to a copy revised (like the *Fasti*) by Ovid in exile, and that one or two apparently ‘prophetic’ touches such as this [sc. *Met.* 2.377–78] were introduced by him during revision. They are certainly striking, but hardly numerous enough for coincidence to be ruled out.” Putnam (2001, 182) writes: “It is my strong suspicion that Ovid was able to revise the *Metamorphoses* after his relegation had been pronounced or even accomplished.” See also McGowan 2009, 195–96; and see Bömer 1969, 488–89, for earlier bibliography.

22. For *error*, cf. *Tr.* 1.2.99, 1.3.37, 2.109, 3.1.52, 3.5.52, 3.6.26, 3.11.34, 4.1.23, 4.4.39, 4.8.40, 4.10.90; *Pont.* 2.2.55, 2.2.61, 2.3.92, 3.3.75, 3.9.11, 4.8.20, 4.15.25; see also Ciccarelli 2003, 107–8; Ingleheart 2010, 3–4.

23. Heinsius’s correction of MSS *prima* is called for by sense, “inepte enim *Metamorphoses* ‘libellus’ vocentur” (“for it would be clumsy to call the *Metamorphoses* a *libellus* or ‘little book’”), and the error is easily explained by the fact that *prima fronte* is a common phrase (*TLL* s.v. *frons* 1365.28–43).

24. See Hinds 1985, 26, on how Ovid transforms the poem of transformations into a calque on his own changed state, and cf. Gareth Williams 2002, 378–81. Enough readers in antiquity and the Middle Ages took Ovid at his word that the six verses were prefixed to several manuscripts in the tradition. Details can be found in Munari 1957; cf. Richmond 2002, 444. It is unlikely, however, that this is the result of their actually appearing in the first edition distributed by Ovid, as Luck (1977, 67) believes: their presence in the MS tradition of the *Metamorphoses* reflects the process of reception, not transmission.

25. Most MSS read *eram* here, with a minority recording *erat*, the *lectio facilior* in this context, accepted by, e.g., Luck and Hall. Heinsius reports the variant but does not accept it, rightly: the text of the new preface has been ambiguous in its first five lines as to speaker, but concludes, like the fifteen rolls of the *Metamorphoses* themselves, with a *sphragis* in the first person singular.

26. On other correspondences and the relationship established by the theme of sight, see Ingleheart 2006.

27. Can there have been readers in antiquity who interpreted it in this way? I would like to think so, and as a possible instance I think of the owner of what we know as the House of Octavius Quartio in Pompeii. Sometime between 62 CE and the eruption of Vesuvius, his garden terrace was decorated with frescoes and sculptures meant to evoke Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. At one end of the long canal that cuts across the terrace, in a forest setting presided over by Orpheus and Aphrodite, are two painted scenes depicting the tragic consequences of personal passions gone astray: Narcissus gazing upon his own reflection and Thisbe falling upon a sword over the body of Pyramus. At the other end is Actaeon being devoured by his hounds, with Diana embarrassed at her bath. The owner of the house who commissioned these paintings clearly knew and admired the *Metamorphoses*. Had he read, and did he recognize the interpretative consequences, of the *Tristia*? Would later readers of the *Metamorphoses* have recognized in the story of Actaeon (or others in the poem) a theme that they could relate to their own experiences under a despotic regime? From his perch in Tomi, Ovid did much to encourage this possibility.

28. But see the review by Jim McKeown (1981). And for a more nuanced interpretation of Jupiter's role in the *Metamorphoses* and comparisons, implied and otherwise, with Augustus, see Segal 2001.

29. For a list of passages in the exile poetry, see Helzlsouer 1989 on *Pont.* 4.3.56. On Ovid's figuring of Augustus as Jupiter, see further Scott 1930, 52–55; Broege 1972, 37; Beller 1979, 72–75.

30. See Barchiesi 2005, 268, on this unexpected moralizing comment.

31. As noted by Bömer 1969, ad loc. The adverb is otherwise attested in verse only at Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.75 but is common in ordinary prose. On the distribution of such forms in Latin verse, see Håkanson 1986.

32. On the representation of Olympus in terms that call to mind the Roman Senate and Augustus's primacy, see Feeney 1991, 199–200.

33. Such a reading is consistent with the view presented by Millar 1993, which, to my mind, is more than plausible, that Ovid writes from exile as a “rejected loyalist.”

34. Putnam (2001, 184–87) remarks (186), “I would suggest, then, that whether or not it was revised after Ovid's own exile the episode of Phaethon also reflects his deep concern with the meaning of exile even if not yet experienced at first hand.”

35. The epithet *saevus* is not used casually of the gods: cf. Knox 1997. Striking, too, is Ovid's explicit declaration in *Tr.* 4.3.69: “*saevus* ego sum Iovis *ignibus* ictus” (“I have been struck by Jupiter's *savage flames*”).

36. See Claassen 1999, 137–38, for thematic distinctions among *Tr.* 1–4, 5, and *Pont.* 1–4; cf. Evans 1983, 151.

37. Cf. Hardie 2002, 283: “It is not his poetry but his own, real-life, person that Ovid wishes to communicate to his audience. His poetry is now an unmediated expression of his daily experience.”

38. Putnam (2001, 182–83) is among the more recent critics who think it would have been impossible for Ovid to write before his relegation.

39. For Ovid's emphasis on the popular reception of his work, cf. also *Tr.* 4.1.67–68: “vivere quam miserum est inter Bessosque Getasque / illum, qui *populi* semper in ore fuit” (“how wretched it is that the one who was ever upon the lips of the *people* now lives among the Bessi and the Getes”); *Pont.* 2.4.15: “quod tu laudaras, *populo* placuisse putabam” (“whatever you praised, I rated as *popular*”). And it is how Ovid reconfigures his early career, insisting upon its popularity from the start: “carmina cum primum *populo* iuvenalia legi” (“when I first read my youthful poetry to the *people*,” *Tr.* 4.10.57). One item in the dossier of evidence that Ovid was right about his broad popularity is the widespread distribution in Pompeii of frescoes reflecting stories from the *Metamorphoses*: cf. Knox 2014.

40. On which I have nothing to add to Knox 2004.

41. The phrase “ille ego” is indeed amply attested in funerary inscriptions, and although it is not possible to assign any to a date before Ovid, the preponderance of the evidence suggests that Ovid was echoing a known formula; cf. Fairweather 1987, 187.

42. Cf. Tissol 2014, ad loc.: “Emphatic repetition heightens the irony: the poet of the *Met.* cannot escape suffering through transformation.”

Ovidian Itineraries in Flavian Epic

ALISON KEITH

As has long been recognized, repetition is fundamental to Ovid's poetics. We can document his interest in many facets of repetition throughout his poetic corpus—from the verbal jingles recorded by the elder Seneca in *Controversiae* 2.2.12;¹ through the so-called double *Heroides*, which replicate the structural conjunction of Ovid's single *Heroides* with his friend Sabinus's rejoinders to them (*Am.* 2.18.21–34);² and well beyond, to the repetition of subject matter between poems (such as, e.g., the rape of Proserpina, treated in both *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4; see Heinze 1919; Hinds 1987); and thematic recapitulation (e.g., of theodicy) and intratextuality both within individual poems³ and across the corpus.⁴ Ovid's densely allusive style may be considered another facet of his poetics of repetition, although in this regard his poetics are clearly aligned with, rather than to be distinguished from, the compositional practices of his elder contemporaries Vergil and Horace.

Ovid's predilection for repetition, in all its forms, is perhaps most clearly visible in his reworking of the central myth of Vergil's *Aeneid* in *Metamorphoses* 13.623–14.608, a passage that has become something of a touchstone for Latin literary critics of allusion and intertextuality (Tissol 1993; Hinds 1998; Casali 2007, all with further bibliography), but that also displays Ovid's characteristic iterative wordplay (e.g., *Met.* 14.81, of Dido, “deceptaque decipit omnes”). His bold appropriation of Vergilian myth here anticipates the enthusiastic re-elaboration of the myths he includes in the *Metamorphoses* by imperial practitioners of Latin epic from Manilius to Claudian (as well as genres other than epic, both verse and prose) (see esp. Hinds 2007 and 2011; Keith and Rupp 2007). As Stephen Hinds (2011, 9) has recently argued, “For any formal Roman poet of the mid to late 1st century CE, the whole system of Greco-Roman myth has an important and inescapable post-Ovidian dimension.”

Ovid himself, of course, is our first surviving example of this phenomenon, reworking the *Metamorphoses* throughout his exilic corpus (Hinds 1999). But Manilius, as a close contemporary, is also an early witness to the distinctively, and pervasively, Ovidian configurations that classical myth exhibits in first-century CE Latin literature.⁵ While his didactic subject and metrical practices align Manilius with the model of Vergil in the *Georgics*, the fifth book of his *Astronomica* includes an account of Perseus's rescue of Andromeda that extensively reworks Ovid's own version of the myth in *Metamorphoses* 4, and illustrates his considerable debt to Ovidian epic in subject matter, theme, and literary style, even as he pointedly corrects Ovid's unaccountable omission of the metamorphic capstone of the myth—namely the multiple catasterisms of Perseus and the sea monster, Andromeda and her parents (*Astr.* 5.449–85, 504–630).

Manilius's early, and quintessentially Ovidian, appropriation of his predecessor's mythic material is a harbinger of the reception of the myths of the *Metamorphoses* in first-century CE Latin epic. For while Ovid retells the central myth of Vergil's *Aeneid*, none of the Flavian epic poets directly take it up (although in Lucan and Silius it becomes essentially typological for Roman political and literary history). Rather, like Manilius, the Flavian epic poets obsessively rehearse myths from Ovid's repertoire in the *Metamorphoses* (Keith 2002, 2004–5, 2011, 2013, 2014a, 2014b; Newlands 2004).⁶ Most obviously, Statius and Valerius Flaccus wrote long mythological epics about Thebes and the Argonauts, drawing extensively on Ovid's Theban history of books 3–4 and on his treatment of Medea and the Argonauts in book 7, respectively. In addition, as Gianpiero Rosati (1992) and Stephen Hinds (2000), among others, have argued, Statius's fragmentary epic on Achilles exhibits multiple Ovidian intertexts. The mythological excursions in the historical epics of the Neronian Lucan and the Flavian Silius Italicus also betray a recurrent debt to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁷ Although in composing historico-martial epic, Silius (like Lucan) embraces the epic model of Vergil, his inclusion of myth—through history, simile, and analogy—admits to his historical epic a good deal of material traditionally associated with mythological epic. Despite his Vergilian mytho-historical subject, in fact, Silius tends to look to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (and *Fasti*) for the myths that he admits to his poem. In this chapter I focus on the recycling of Ovidian myths in the long mythological epics of Valerius and Statius and the long historical epic of Silius in order to examine their recuperation of Ovidian thematics in the re-elaboration of some of his most famous myths.

VALERIUS FLACCUS

Valerius Flaccus announces the subject of his poem (*Argon.* 1.1–3) as “the first straits traversed by the gods’ great sons” and the “prophetic ship,” the *Argo*, “which dared to pursue the shores of Scythian Phasis” (“Prima deum magnis canimus freta pervia natis / fatidicamque ratem, Scythici quae Phasidis oras / ausa sequi”). Critics have identified the multiple sources for these lines, including Apollonius, Catullus, Horace, Ovid, and Seneca. If Apollonius is obviously a significant model, Alessandro Barchiesi (2001, 330–31, cited by Zissos 2008, 72) has noted that so is the opening of an Ovidian propempticon in the second book of the *Amores* (*Am.* 2.11.1–4), which begins as a “meta-*Argonautica*” and has influenced Valerius’s choice of opening word (*prima*), the relative clause with *quae*, the anthropomorphism of the *Argo*, and the reference to the Clashing Rocks.⁸

Ovid himself repeatedly treated Argonautic material, primarily in conjunction with Medea, who is the subject not only of his lost tragedy, but also of *Heroides* 6 and 12 as well as the first half of *Metamorphoses* 7. Valerius’s debt to Ovid’s Argonautic itinerary in *Metamorphoses* 7 emerges in his formulation of the *Argo*’s goal as “Phasidis oras” (“the shores of Scythian Phasis,” *Argon.* 1.2; cf. “Phasidis amnem,” 4.616), which recalls Ovid’s own introductory scene setting for his Argonautic narrative at the outset of *Metamorphoses* 7 (“contiguerant rapidas limosi Phasidos undas,” “they reached the rapid waves of muddy Phasis,” *Met.* 7.6, itself modeled on Catullus’s Argonautic narrative in 64.2–3, “dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas / Phasidos ad fluctus,” “they are said to have sailed through the liquid waves of Neptune’s ocean to Phasis’ waters”). Moreover, Valerius’s rehearsal in his proem of the mythological *translatio imperii* from east to west realized under the rule of his deified dedicatee, the emperor Vespasian (*Argon.* 1.15–21), also evokes the narrative trajectory of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* from Greece to Rome, culminating in the projected deification of Augustus (*Met.* 15.855–70).

Valerius’s lexical and mythological debts, in his proem, to Catullus 64, Ovid’s *Amores* 2, and *Metamorphoses* 7 stand in particularly close relation to his description of the *Argo* some hundred lines later (1.130–48). The ecphrasis has been interpreted as “surcharged” with programmatic intertextuality,⁹ through what Martha Davis (1990, 48) has called the literalization of the metaphor of the ship of poetry. Of the ecphrasis, Barchiesi (1995, 62) has observed that “the selection and treatment of scenes invokes a specific mytho-poetic tradition, that of Catullus 64 and, above all, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*” while Andrew Zissos (2008), in his commentary on *Argonautica* 1, has detailed

Valerius's specific lexical and thematic debts in the passage to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.¹⁰ It is thus not surprising that on the voyage to Colchis, the Flavian epicist's *Argo* continually revisits myths and mythological sites made famous by Ovid's epic (Herschkowitz 1998, 68–78), often, though not exclusively, in passages that seem to renew the sexual symbolism with which Ovid had invested the *locus amoenus* as a landscape of desire (Hinds 2002).¹¹ An early example in the *Argonautica* comes in the second book, when the Valerian Hercules rescues the Trojan princess Hesione from a rocky crag in the Troad (*Argon.* 2.451–549). The myth is briefly related by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* 11.205–13, but only rarely elsewhere in extant Latin literature (Bömer 1980, *ad loc.*).

In his treatment of this episode, Valerius closely reworks Ovid's account of how the hero Perseus rescued the Ethiopian princess Andromeda from a rocky crag in Libya (*Met.* 4.668–88), an episode that, we have seen, had already captured the attention of Manilius. Valerius specifies Perseus as an especially apt model for his own hero early in the epic (*Argon.* 1.64–70), when Jason is commissioned by the tyrant Pelias to recover the golden fleece from Aetes in Colchis. Jason is described here as wishing he possessed the heroic attributes of Perseus (his winged sandals) or Triptolemus (Ceres's airborne chariot, harnessed to flying dragons) (Zissos 2008, 120). Both mythical heroes receive their fullest treatment in extant Latin literature from Ovid, who follows the lengthy Perseus panel of *Metamorphoses* 4.610–5.249 with his famous account in *Metamorphoses* 5 of Proserpina's rape, Ceres's grief, and her gift of agriculture through the agency of Triptolemus (5.642–61), though the latter's story is still more extensively elaborated in *Fasti* 4 (502–60).

I have discussed elsewhere the Herculean resonances in Ovid's treatment of Perseus in *Metamorphoses* 4–5, where Perseus finds his heroic mettle tested in a series of trials (*labor*, 4.739; *factum*, 4.757; *pericula*, 4.787) (Keith 1999a). Ovid alludes to Hercules's theft of the apples of the Hesperides in the course of his treatment of Perseus's encounter with Atlas (4.644–45) and applies the noun *labor* to Perseus's conquest of the sea monster (“pretiumque et causa laboris,” “price and cause of his toil,” 4.739; cf. “iuvenis virtus per tot spectata labores,” “the youth's courage, visible in so many labors,” 5.243). Another prize worthy of the hero is Andromeda herself, both the reason and the reward for Perseus's battle with the sea monster (4.739; cf. “tanti praemia facti,” “the rewards of so great a deed,” 4.757; *praemia*, 5.25). His Herculean deliverance of the helpless maiden from the monster constitutes proof of his Herculean *virtus* (“ut mea sit servata mea virtute, paciscor,” “I pledge that, saved by my bravery, she will be mine,” 4.703; cf. 5.243).

When Valerius comes to relate Hercules's own exemplary rescue of a maiden (the Trojan princess Hesione) abandoned to the ravages of a sea monster, therefore, Ovid's Herculean Perseus provides an especially apt model. Particularly striking is the (non-Ovidian) phrasing of Valerius's opening description of the seductive charms of the shore of the Troad (*Argon.* 2.451–52): “Alcides Telamonque comes dum *litora* blando / *anfractu sinuosa* legunt” (“while Hercules and his comrade Telamon pick their way along the shore winding in a charming curve”). The phrasing invites us to expect an Ovidian narrative of amatory desire such as we find in the Perseus episode of *Metamorphoses* 4, if not an out-and-out rape narrative such as Ovid offers in any number of other episodes in the first five books of the *Metamorphoses*.¹² Valerius plays against our Ovidian expectations, however, by giving us an Ovidian narrative setting that evokes the divine rapes of the early books of the *Metamorphoses*, and then placing into that setting a thoroughly “epic” Hercules, motivated by glory rather than by love (as Perseus was) to save the beautiful maiden (cf. *Argon.* 2.493–96).¹³

Hercules is introduced as Alcides, “grandson of Alcaeus,” the son of Perseus and father of Amphitryo, the mortal father of Hercules. Common though the patronymic undoubtedly is in Latin epic,¹⁴ Valerius's use of it here implicitly acknowledges his hero's genealogical descent from Perseus in myth as well as his literary descent from Ovid's Perseus narrative in *Metamorphoses* 4–5. Certainly the Valerian Hercules imitates his Ovidian exemplar throughout his heroic rescue of Hesione. Both heroes are struck by the sight of a maiden bound to a rock and exposed to a cruel death (*Met.* 4.627; *Argon.* 2.463), looking for all the world like a statue (*Met.* 4.675; *Argon.* 2.465–66),¹⁵ despite her tears (*Met.* 4.674; *Argon.* 2.464). Both inquire into her lineage (*Met.* 4.678–81; *Argon.* 2.468–69) and hear her plaintive tale (*Met.* 4.685–88; *Argon.* 2.471–92) before rescuing her from the sea monster (*Met.* 4.695–739; *Argon.* 2.512–49), though their rewards for epic valor differ. Perseus demands Andromeda as his wife (*Met.* 4.703; cf. *praemia*, *Met.* 4.757, 5.25), while Hercules accepts the horses Laomedon promises, but postpones collection until his return (“*mox huc vestras revehemur ad oras / donaue dicta feram*,” “soon we shall return to your shores here and I shall take the promised gifts,” 2.575–76). In his characterization of Hercules, Valerius alludes only obliquely to Perseus's erotic motivation: in the seductive landscape setting that opens the episode, and again at the end, in a simile that compares Hercules's victory over the sea monster to the victory of a bull in a contest for love (*Argon.* 2.545–49),¹⁶ which reverses

as it rehearses Vergil's description of bulls fighting over a heifer in the third *Georgic* (3.224–28).¹⁷

Elsewhere in his *Argonautica*, however, Valerius explicitly recuperates the erotic undertones of Ovid's *locus amoenus* landscapes to support the amatory underpinning of his main narrative, especially in his association of the young Medea with the verdant landscape of Hecate's grove outside Colchis (*Argon.* 5.333–51, 6.495–502; *Met.* 7.74–95). Valerius flags the setting as an Ovidian *topos* when he introduces it by comparing the banks of the Phasis to the site of Proserpina's rape in Sicily (*Argon.* 5.333–35, 341–49):¹⁸

namque soporatos tacitis in sedibus artus
 dum permit alta quies nullaeque in virgine curae,
 visa pavens castis Hecates excedere lucis . . .
 his turbata minis fluvios ripamque petebat
 Phasidis aequali Scythidum comitante caterva.
florae per verni qualis iuga duxit Hymetti
 aut Sicula sub rupe choros hinc gressibus haerens
 Pallados hinc carae Proserpina iuncta Dianae,
 altior ac nulla comitum certante, prius quam
 palluit et viso pulsus decor omnis Averno:
 talis et in vittis geminae cum lumine taedae
 Colchis erat . . .

For while deep quiet held her slumbering limbs in the silent bedchamber and no trouble was in her maidenly breast, she seemed to her terror to step forth from Hecate's holy grove. . . . Disturbed by these threatening signs she sought the banks of Phasis' stream amid a band of Scythian girls, her peers in age. As Proserpine in spring-time led the dance over Hymettus' flowering ridges or beneath the cliffs of Sicily, on this side stepping close by Pallas, on that side hand in hand with her beloved Diana, taller than they and surpassing all her fellows, before she grew pale at the sight of Avernus and all her beauty fled: so fair also was the Colchian in her sacred fillets by the light of her twin torches . . .

The basic plot of the nubile maiden, disturbed by dreams, going down to the riverbank, where she is compared to Artemis, is Homeric, applied to Nausicaa in *Odyssey* 6, and subsequently rehearsed by Apollonius in application

to Medea in *Argonautica* 3. The comparison to Sicily and the reference to Proserpina's rape there, however, are Ovidian intrusions into this Homero-Apollonian matrix, for the site of Proserpina's rape in Sicily was the subject of a famous ecphrasis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 5.385–95):

Haud procul Hennaeis lacus est a moenibus altae,
 nomine Pergus, aquae; non illo plura Caystros
 carmina cycnorum labentibus audit in undis.
 silva coronat aquas cingens latus omne suisque
 frondibus ut velo Phoebeos summovet ictus.
 frigora dant rami, varios humus umida flores;
 perpetuum ver est. quo dum Proserpina luco
ludit et aut violas aut candida lilia carpit,
 dumque puellari studio calathosque sinumque
 implet et aequales certat superare legendo,
 paene simul visa est dilectaque raptaque Diti; . . .

Not far from the walls of Enna is a pool of deep water, Pergus by name;
 Cayster does not hear more swans' songs in its gliding waters than that pool.
 A surrounding forest crowns the waters on every side, and keeps away the
 sun's rays with its foliage as with an awning; the branches supply cool shade,
 the moist earth purple flowers: there is everlasting spring. While Proserpina
 plays in this grove and plucks either violets or white lilies, and while she fills
 her baskets and lap in girlish enthusiasm and contests to surpass her
 companions in gathering, almost as soon as she was seen, she was loved and
 ravished by Dis . . .

Valerius's Ovidian topography puts pressure on the Homero-Apollonian template of his narrative, in which a foreign hero's arrival leads an unmarried princess to think of marriage, and the Flavian epicist thereby motivates more fully the Apollonian outcome, in which the intruder in the landscape ravishes the maiden whose beauty the landscape represents.¹⁹ Valerius recuperates specific details of Ovid's famous ecphrasis to mark the debt. As Medea sets out from Hecate's grove, she seems to enter that Ovidian glade (*Met.* 5.391) not far from Enna's walls (*Met.* 5.385) under the Sicilian cliffs (*Argon.* 5.544), where Proserpina (*Met.* 5.390; *Argon.* 5.545) frolicked with her playfellows (*Met.* 5.394; *Argon.* 5.542), plucking the flowers (*Met.* 5.392; *Argon.* 5.548) of spring (*Met.* 5.391; *Argon.* 5.543), before being no sooner seen than ravished (*rapta*,

Met. 5.394; cf. *Argon.* 5.542) by the Lord of the Underworld (*Met.* 5.395; *Argon.* 5.547). Even Valerius's image of flowering Hymettus (*Argon.* 5.543) may be owed to Ovid, for in *Metamorphoses* 7 the Ovidian Cephalus encounters Aurora on Mount Hymettus and is no sooner seen than he is, like Proserpina, ravished (*Met.* 7.702–4): “vertice de summo semper florentis Hymetti / lutea mane videt pulsus Aurora tenebris / invitumque rapit” (“golden Aurora, driving off the shadows in the morning, saw me on the very top of ever-flowering Hymettus, and ravished me against my will”).

In repeatedly setting nubile maidens in the verdant landscapes of desire that Ovid developed in the *Metamorphoses*, Valerius plays upon the erotic underpinnings of his own martial narrative and pays homage at the same time to his Augustan predecessor's co-implication of desire and violence in the epic landscape. A sophisticated reader of Ovid's epic, Valerius works both with and against the landscape descriptions of the *Metamorphoses* to highlight the themes of his own mythological epic. When we turn to Statius's *Thebaid* and the renovation there of Ovidian mythic topoi, we see a similarly knowing rehearsal of Ovidian myths and topographies in the service of a much darker worldview.

PAPINIUS STATIUS

As is well known, in his prologue to the *Thebaid* Statius disavows the subjects of Ovid's Theban narrative in *Metamorphoses* 3–4, with a summary of the history of Thebes that he will *not* narrate (*Theb.* 1.4–17):²⁰

gentisne canam primordia dirae,
 Sidonios raptus et inexorabile pactum
 legis Agenoreae scrutantemque aequora Cadmum?
longa retro series, trepidum si Martis operti
 agricolam infandis condentem proelia sulcis
 expdiam penitusque sequar, quo carmine muris
 iusserit Amphion Tyrios accedere montes,
 unde graves irae cognata in moenia Baccho,
 quod saevae Iunonis opus, cui sumpserit arcus
 infelix Athamas, cur non expaverit ingens
 Ionium socio casura Palaemone mater.
atque adeo iam nunc gemitus et prospera Cadmi
 praeteriisse sinam: limes mihi carminis esto
 Oedipodae confusa domus . . .

Shall I sing the origins of the dread family, the seizure of the Sidonian maiden, the relentless terms of Agenor's ruling, and Cadmus scouring the sea? The line of ancestors runs far back, if I unfold the tale of the anxious farmer of hidden war who sowed battle lines in accursed furrows, and then press on deep with the incantation by which Amphion bade the Tyrian mountains approach the city-walls; the source of Bacchus' harsh anger against his relatives' city; the deed of savage Juno; the target against whom unfortunate Athamas took up his bow; the reason why his mother did not blanch at the huge Ionian sea when she was poised to leap in with her son Palaemon. And so now I shall allow the sorrows and successes of Cadmus to pass by: let the confused house of Oedipus be the path of my song.

Philip Hardie (1990, 226n13) has remarked that "the *longa retro series* of Stat. *Theb.* 1.4–16 is virtually a summary of Ovid's Theban books," drawing attention to the phrasing of Ovid's retrospective summary of his Theban tales (*Met.* 4.564): "*serieque malorum*" ("a series of misfortunes"). Statius's disavowal of Ovid's subjects at *Thebaid* 1.15–16 is itself articulated in Ovidian terms, for Ovid frames his Theban narrative as the story of the illusory prosperity of the exiled Cadmus (*Met.* 3.131–37, 4.564–67), beginning his recital of Cadmus's misfortunes with a similar *sententia* (3.138–39): "*prima nepos inter tot res tibi, Cadme, secundas / causa fuit luctus*" ("Among so many prosperous affairs, Cadmus, the first source of grief for you was a grandson"). Scholars like P. J. Davis (1993) and Alan Heinrich (1999) have noted Statius's thematization of Theban history throughout the poem, but the Flavian poet signals his specific engagement with Ovid's Thebes here not only in his catalogue of themes but also, especially, in his diction. Statius thus hints that his predecessor's narrative of the House of Cadmus cannot be so easily dissociated from his own narrative of the House of Oedipus.

Ovid's Thebes extends its rule over a beautiful but deadly landscape—trackless wilds of woods and mountains ideally suited to hunting, though monstrous failure seems inevitably to attend individual Thebans' departures from the city, whether they go into exile or to hunt.²¹ The opposition between city and wilderness is repeatedly figured in the wanderings of members of the Theban royal house as well as in the succession of bestial threats the Cadmeans face. Bidden by his father, Agenor, to find his sister Europa, Cadmus embarks on a fruitless search that Ovid represents from the start as exile from his ancestral lands (*Met.* 3.6–7). Consultation of the oracle of Apollo at Delphi imposes further wandering on the exiled Tyrian, when he is told to found

a city on the site where an unyoked cow lies down. The unyoked cow stands as an image of the wilderness Cadmus is to civilize through city foundation, as does the serpent of Mars that guards the local spring, attacking and killing the Tyrians when Cadmus sends them to procure water for sacrifice. Although Cadmus overcomes the snake and founds the city of Thebes, at the end of his life, overwhelmed by a succession of familial disasters, he goes into exile once again. Recognizing the impiety of his killing of the serpent, he is finally transformed, along with his wife Harmonia, into a snake (*Met.* 4.576–79). In Ovid's account of early Theban history, the founder's biography supplies the template for his descendants and fellow Thebans, who similarly abandon the city to face the dangers of untamed nature and vengeful deities: Actaeon, Narcissus, Athamas and Ino in the hunt; Pentheus in search of the Theban women and their celebration of the rites of Dionysus. In their repeated rehearsal of what I have identified as the Cadmean paradigm, Ovid's Thebans exemplify the relentless return to origins that Froma Zeitlin (1990) has identified at the heart of Theban myth, especially in its tragic instantiations.

Statius revisits the Cadmean pattern of exile and bestial transformation in his representation of the House of Oedipus, introducing Oedipus himself alive and brooding in his self-imposed darkness (*Theb.* 1.46–48): “*impia iam merita scrutatus lumina dextra / merserat aeterna damnatum nocte pudorem / Oedipodes*” (“having scoured his impious eyes with deserving hand, Oedipus had already submerged his guilty shame in everlasting night”). The verb Statius uses of Oedipus's self-blinding, *scrutatus*, signals his genealogical and thematic descent from Cadmus, who in Statius's proem similarly “probes” the seas for his sister Europa (*Theb.* 1.6, quoted above). Oedipus's Cadmean descent is reflected in his repetition of his ancestor's quest, for which Ovid's Cadmus supplies the model (*Met.* 3.3–5): “*cum pater ignarus Cadmo perquirere raptam / imperat et poenam, si non invenerit, addit / exilium, facto pius et sceleratus eodem*” (“when his father, unaware of the truth, bade Cadmus search out his ravished daughter and added the penalty of exile should he be unable to find her, both pious and wicked in the same deed”). Moreover, Statius represents Oedipus's life within the depths of the palace of Cadmus as a figurative exile imposed on him by his sons, who have deprived him of his kingdom (“*orbem visu regnisque carentem / non regere aut dictis maerentem flectere adorti*,” “My sons do not guide me, deprived of sight and lacking a kingdom, or sway my grief with words,” *Theb.* 1.74–75), in an inversion of the literal exile of the Ovidian Cadmus from Tyre, which was imposed on him by his father.

Statius signals his literary debt to Ovid's Theban history in his depiction of Oedipus's self-blinding, which adapts the blinding of the Ovidian Tiresias, deprived of his sight by the vindictive Juno (*Met.* 3.333–35): “*gravius Saturnia iusto / nec pro materia fertur doluisse suique / iudicis aeterna damnavit lumina nocte*” (“Saturn's daughter is said to have resented this more gravely than was right, out of all proportion to the matter at hand, and she condemned the eyes of her own judge to everlasting night”). The implication that the blind Ovidian seer informs Statius's blind Oedipus confirms the Flavian epic's literary descent from Ovid's Theban history and offers ironic comment on the conspicuous absence of Oedipus (and indeed the House of Labdacus) from Ovid's “*Thebaid*.”

This coheres with the moral that the Statian Jupiter himself draws, at the outset of the poem, that character is inherited (*Theb.* 1.227–31):

mens cunctis imposta *manet*: quis funera Cadmi
nesciat et totiens excitam a sedibus imis
Eumenidum bellasse aciem, mala gaudia matrum
erroresque feros nemorum et reticenda deorum
crimina?

The mind implanted in all remains: who does not know Cadmus' funerals, the Furies' battle line so often provoked to warfare from the underworld, the mothers' evil joys, savage wanderings in the woods, the crimes against the gods that must not be mentioned?

The history of the House of Cadmus, Jupiter here insists, conditions contemporary events in the House of Oedipus. But Statius's Jupiter need not elaborate the dark deeds of the Cadmeans, because they have been chronicled in Ovid's Theban narrative; the god's rhetorical question here recalls Statius's *praeteritio* in the proem (1.15–16). Statius's Jupiter even echoes an Ovidian statement of the immutability of character, applied to Cadmus's grandson Actaeon after his transformation into a stag (*Met.* 3.203): “*mens tantum pristina mansit*” (“only his mind remains as it was”). Statius thus adapts a general rule of Ovidian characterization—the idea that the mind of the metamorphosed individual remains unchanged—to suggest that his characters inherit a disposition toward crime, implanted in the Theban royal house by their Ovidian ancestry. The deliberate play on Ovid's treatment of character points to a literary conception of genealogy and transmission.

Statius revisits the Cadmean pattern of exile in his portrait of Polynices as he goes into exile in *Thebaid* 1.²² An unnamed Theban draws the link between Cadmus's wanderings and his descendants' exile (*Theb.* 1.180–85):

an inde vetus Thebis extenditur omen,
ex quo Sidonii nequiquam blanda iuveni
pondera Carpathio iussus sale quaerere Cadmus
exsul Hyanteos invenit regna per agros,
fraternasque acies fetae telluris hiatu
augurium seros dimisit ad usque nepotes?

Or does the old omen extend to modern Thebes, from the time when Cadmus, bidden to search vainly for the pretty burden of the Sidonian bullock in the Carpathian sea, found in exile a kingdom in Boeotian fields, and in the aperture of the fertile earth left kindred battle-lines as an augury to his late-born descendants?

Statius dubs both Cadmus and Polynices “the Tyrian exile” (1.153–54, 3.406) on the model of the Ovidian Cadmus, himself a Tyrian (*Met.* 3.35, 129; 4.572)²³ and an exile (*Met.* 3.6–7; 4.567–68). The exquisite geographical epithet *Hyanteus* in the anonymous critic's speech (*Theb.* 1.183) also points specifically to Ovid, for it first appears in extant Latin in the *Metamorphoses* (5.312, 8.310) and varies the Augustan poet's *Hyantius*, applied to Cadmus's grandson Actaeon as he wanders in the Theban landscape (*Met.* 3.146–47): “cum iuvenis placido per devia lustra vagantes / participes operum conpellat Hyantius ore” (“when the Boeotian youth addressed with friendly words his comrades in the hunt as they wandered through the trackless wilds”).²⁴ When Polynices leaves Thebes, therefore, he rehearses both Cadmus's exile and Actaeon's wanderings (*Theb.* 1.312–14): “Interea patriis olim vagus exsul ab oris / Oedipodionides furto deserta pererrat / Aoniae” (“meanwhile the son of Oedipus, long a wandering exile from his ancestral lands, furtively traversed the wilds of Boeotia”). As his characters travel through the topography of Ovid's Theban narrative, so Statius traverses a series of Ovidian mythological topoi.

Polynices's path in the *Thebaid* leads initially from Thebes to Argos (*Theb.* 1.324–35):

tunc sedet Inachias urbes²⁵ Danaeiaeque arva
et caligantes abrupto sole Mycenae

ferre iter impavidum, seu praevia ducit Erinys,
 seu fors illa viae, sive hac immota vocabat
 Atropos. Ogygiis ululata furoribus antra
 deserit et pingues Baccheo sanguine colles.
 inde plagam, qua molle sedens in plana Cithaeron
 porrigitur lassumque inclinat ad aequora montem,
 praeterit. hinc arte scopuloso in limite pendens
 infames Scirone petras Scyllaeaque rura
 purpureo regnata seni mitemque Corinthon
 linquit et in mediis audit duo litora campis.

Then he settled on bearing his journey without fear to Inachos' cities and Danae's fields, and Mycenae, which grew dark at the withdrawal of the sun—whether the Fury preceded him on his way or the chance direction of the road, or Atropos summoned him by this road. He left the glades that resound with Theban cries and the hills rich with Bacchic blood and then passes by the region where Cithaeron stretches, settling gently to the plain, and slopes wearily to the sea. Then, climbing skillfully up a rocky path, he left behind Sciron's notorious cliffs and Scylla's country where the purple-haired king ruled, and gentle Corinth, and heard the two shores of the Isthmus resound in the middle of the plain.

Oedipus's son here retraces Ovid's narrative trajectory in *Metamorphoses* 4, from Thebes to Argos (*Met.* 4.606–11):

solus Abantiades ab origine cretus eadem
 Acrisius superest, qui moenibus arceat urbis
 Argolicae contraque deum ferat arma genusque
 non putet esse Iovis; neque enim Iovis esse putabat
 Persea, quem pluvio Danae conceperat auro.

Only Abas' grandson Acrisius, sprung from the same origin as Bacchus (*sc.* Jupiter), remains to shut the god out of the walls of his Argive city and bear arms against the god, and believe his lineage not to be Jove's; for neither did he think that Perseus was Jove's son, whom Danae conceived in a shower of gold.

Ovid's geographical conjunction pivots on the impious rejection of Bacchus's godhead by Perseus's grandfather Acrisius, who rehearses the Theban Pentheus's

rash decision to take up arms against the god (*Met.* 4.607–11). Ovid's narrative linkage looks very much like one of those "frigid" transitions deprecated by Quintilian (4.1.77) as a "childish affectation," but whatever we may think of Ovid's geographical sleight of hand here, his facility in handling quick scene changes is imitated by Statius, who draws on the diction and themes of the *Metamorphoses* repeatedly in his own narrative conjunction of Argos with Thebes. For in his exposition of Polynices's route from Thebes to Argos, Statius adopts an Ovidian coinage (*Am.* 3.6.13; *Ars am.* 1.225), the adjective *Danaëia* meaning "of or connected with Danaë" (*Theb.* 1.324), to characterize the *telos* of Polynices's exilic journey (and he will later apply the adjective to the Argive seer Amphiaraus, 6.462). Leaving behind Cithaeron, Polynices heads toward the Isthmus by way of Sciron's cliffs and Scylla's country (i.e., Megara). Ovid retells both stories in the *Metamorphoses*: he is the earliest extant Latin exponent of the myth of Sciron (to which he alludes at *Met.* 7.443–47), though but one in a series of "neoteric" poets (e.g., Parthenius in his *Metamorphoses*, *SH* 637; Vergil in *Ecl.* 6.74–77; and the pseudo-Vergilian *Ciris*) to relate (at *Met.* 8.6–151) the myth of Scylla.²⁶

Statius returns to a specifically Ovidian narrative trajectory at the end of *Thebaid* 1 (1.557–720), when Polynices finally reaches Argos, in his redaction of Callimachus's *action* of the origin of an Argive festival in honor of Apollo (Callim. *Aet. fr.* 28–34 M).²⁷ Here Statius heightens the atmosphere of foreboding that attends the preparations for the fratricidal war between the sons of Oedipus by introducing a series of monsters familiar from the (Ovidian) mythological tradition, including Python and Medusa (treated in *Metamorphoses* 1 and 4, respectively). The simultaneous arrival of the Theban exile Polynices and the Calydonian exile Tydeus at the palace of the Argive king Adrastus occurs on the very evening that the Argive court celebrates a festival in honor of Apollo. In the welcome Adrastus extends to his fated sons-in-law, Statius alludes to multiple models in Vergil's *Aeneid*, first and foremost that of Evander's reception of Aeneas and the Trojans in *Aeneid* 8 (Ganiban 2007, 9–23). But in the introduction of Adrastus's daughters to the heroes (*Theb.* 1.533–47), Statius also recalls the disastrous context and consequences of Dido's banquet in *Aeneid* 1, at which the Carthaginian queen "drinks deep draughts of love" (*"longumque bibebat amorem," Aen.* 1.749) from a precious ancestral cup (1.728–30):²⁸ *"hic regina gravem gemmis auroque poposcit / implevitque mero pateram, quam Belus et omnes / a Belo soliti"* ("then the queen called for a cup, heavy with jewels and gold, and filled it with wine—one that Belus and all of Belus' line had been accustomed to use"). So too

Adrastus offers his first libation to Apollo from a family heirloom (Stat. *Theb.* 1.540–43): “signis perfectam auroque nitentem / Iasides pateram famulos ex more poposcit, / qua Danaus libare deis seniorque Phoroneus / adsueti” (“the son of Iasus, as his custom was, bade his attendants bring a goblet wrought with figures and shining with gold, from which both Danaus and old Phoroneus used to pour libation to the gods”).

Statius’s description of the bowl’s decoration, however, finds no analogue in the Vergilian banquet scene (1.543–47):

tenet haec operum caelata figuras:
aureus anguicomam praesecto Gorgona collo
ales habet, iam iamque vagas (ita visus) in auras
exilit; illa graves oculos languentiaque ora
paene movet vivoque etiam pallescit in auro.

This cup, embossed, holds images: a golden, winged figure holds the snake-haired Gorgon head, severed from her neck, and now already wandering, as it seemed, he leapt into the breezes; she nearly moves her heavy eyes and drooping countenance, and even grows pale in the living gold.

Instead, the embossed image of Perseus bearing aloft the Gorgon’s head points specifically to the beginning of Ovid’s “*Perseid*,” where the poet turns from the Argive king Acrisius’s rejection of the godhead of Dionysus (which concludes the Theban narrative of *Met.* 3.1–4.603) to his subsequent failure to recognize his grandson Perseus (*Met.* 4.612–20) (cf. Heuvel 1932, 239–40):

mox tamen Acrisium (tanta est praesentia veri)
tam violasse deum quam non agnosce nepotem
paenitet; impositus iam caelo est alter, at alter
viperei referens spoliū memorabile monstri
aera carpebat tenerum stridentibus alis.
cumque super Libycas victor penderet harenas,
Gorgonei capitis guttae cecidere cruentae,
quas humus exceptas varios animavit in angues;
unde frequens illa est infestaque terra colubris.

Soon, however, Acrisius will regret having profaned the god—such is the presence of the truth—as much as not having recognized his grandson. The former has now been installed in heaven, while the latter was snatching the

slender breezes with hissing wings, bearing the renowned prize of the snaky monster. And when the conquering hero hovered above the sands of Libya some bloody drops fell from the Gorgon's head, which the earth received and brought to life in the form of a variety of snakes; whence that land is teeming and infested with asps.

The Argive narrative in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* supplies an important mythological back-story for the Statian Adrastus's etiology, in the description of Perseus's flight over Libya bearing aloft the memorable prize of his victory over Medusa: her bloody head. On the one hand, Adrastus's recognition of Tydeus and Polynices as his predestined sons-in-law corrects the Ovidian Acrisius's failure to recognize his own grandson, Perseus. But Statius also refashions Ovid's introduction of the Argive hero Perseus, buffeted by the winds as he flies around the Mediterranean ("inde per immensum ventis discordibus actus / nunc huc, nunc illuc exemplo nubis aquosae / fertur," *Met.* 4.621–23), in his own reference to the hero's leap "into the wandering breezes" (*Theb.* 1.545) in order to characterize Adrastus's ancestor as another wandering exile like the Theban Polynices (1.312–14). Statius thereby adapts the Argive Perseus to fit the Cadmean paradigm (of wandering in exile) so prominent in Ovid's Theban narrative—and his own.²⁹

In so doing, moreover, Statius also draws extensively on Ovid's depiction of the monstrous Medusa—part woman, part snake, and mother of the winged horse Pegasus and his brother Chrysaor, father of another of Hercules's victims, the monster Geryon, whose cattle Cacus rashly steals in Evander's *action* of *Aeneid* 8 (8.201–12). Again it is to the Ovidian narrative, reported in the voice of Perseus himself (in *oratio obliqua*), that Statius looks in his brief ecphrasis (*Met.* 4.784–85): "dumque grauis somnus colubrasque ipsamque tenebat / eripuisse caput collo" ("And while heavy sleep held her and her snakes, he severed her head from her neck"). Once a beautiful mortal maiden courted by numerous suitors, the Ovidian Perseus explains, Medusa was transformed by an outraged Minerva into the monstrous Gorgon figure—with hideous face, glaring eyes, and serpents in her hair and girdle—depicted on the shields of mythological heroes to frighten their foes (*Met.* 4.794–803):

clarissima forma
multorumque fuit spes invidiosa procorum

illa, neque in tota conspectior ulla capillis
 pars fuit; inveni, qui se vidisse referret.
 hanc pelagi rector templo vitiasse Minervae
 dicitur; aversa est et castos aegide vultus
 nata Iovis texit, neve hoc impune fuisset,
 Gorgoneum crinem turpes mutavit in hydros.
 nunc quoque, ut attonitos formidine terreat hostes,
 pectore in adverso, quos fecit, sustinet angues.

She was once the most beautiful in form, and the envious goal of many suitors. In all her features, none was more remarkable than her hair—for so I learned from one who said he had seen her. Neptune, the ocean's lord, is said to have ravished her in Minerva's temple: Jove's daughter turned away and covered her pure gaze with her aegis; and lest this go unpunished, she transformed the Gorgon's hair into filthy snakes. And even now, to strike fear into her foes, she wears the snakes, which she made, upon her opposing breast.

The Ovidian Perseus's emphasis on Medusa's shocking transformation from beautiful maiden to terrifying monster, more snake than woman (*hydros*, 4.801; *angues*, 4.803),³⁰ furnishes thematically significant background material for Adrastus's etiological narrative in the *Thebaid* as well. For the Gorgon's snaky head not only functions as the emblem of Perseus's victory embossed on the Argive heirloom (itself a figure for the status of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as a literary artifact in Statius's day) but also foreshadows the death of the monstrous Python, the symbol of Apollo's cosmological victory, which in turn prompts his visit to the Argive court, as Adrastus explains to his guests (*Stat. Theb.* 1.562–74). The passage is well discussed by Charlie McNelis (2007, 29–30), who shows how precisely Statius's diction and geographical setting retrieve minute details of his Ovidian exemplar in *Metamorphoses* 1. As McNelis has shown, while Callimachus is the “source” model for Adrastus's larger etiological tale, and Vergil (and behind him Homer) the “code” model for the epic hospitality scene, Ovid is clearly the “immediate” model for both Statius's Pythian etiology and its thematic complement in the severed head of the emblematic tale of Perseus's conquest of Medusa, embossed on Adrastus's cup.³¹ As Adrastus's tale continues, moreover, the serpentine threat introduced by the Ovidian Medusa, reanimated in the reworking of Apollo's conquest of the Ovidian Python, continues to exert narrative pressure on Statius's Argive narrative.

For just as Ovid's etiology of the Pythian games introduced a tale of Apolline lust, so Adrastus explains that Apollo, after killing the Python and seeking purification at Argos (cf. "nova . . . piacula," 1.569), accepted the hospitality of Crotopus, then king of Argos, whose beautiful virginal daughter Psamathe became the victim of divine lust, like Medusa (and Daphne) before her. The Ovidian resonances of Apollo's rape of Psamathe are clear: "perquirens" ("searching," *Theb.* 1.570), "Delia . . . furta" ("Apollo's intrigues," 1.574–75), "Phoebo sociasset amorem" ("she had shared Phoebus's love," 1.575). But in Statius's hands her death, along with that of her infant, inspires Apollo to a vengeance that, though late, is horrifyingly appropriate. Elsewhere called *Poine*, the monster Apollo sends is the offspring of those other unspeakable chthonic creatures, the snake-haired Furies (1.597–98), who preside over the destruction of Oedipus's house in the *Thebaid* (invoked by Oedipus, at 1.57–87, for his sons' destruction). But Poine also shares a number of features with Medusa. Both Poine and the Furies are distinguished for their serpentine locks, and she shares with both the young Medusa and Psamathe the face and torso of a maiden (1.598–99). Moreover, Poine's function, like that of Medusa and the Furies, is to bring death to mortals, whom she terrifies by the hissing and menacing visage of the snakes that rise from her head (1.599–600); in this guise, she would seem to correspond closely to Medusa. But as her particular purview is to bring death to newborns, in reprisal for the death of Apollo's son, she takes on the characteristic features of the reproductive demon familiar to anthropologists and historians of religion (see Herter 1950; Burkert 1992, 82–87; Johnston 1995). Thus, the dead Psamathe metaphorically rises from the underworld to wreak vengeance, in the form of Poine, not on her persecutors but on her peers. Statius thereby links the former's sexual violation to the latter's monstrous form and pestilential assault on Argive society, and he extends the threat Poine embodies beyond Medusa's battlefield menace, to represent her as a filthy contagion (1.601) that seeps into the most intimate recesses of the Argives' homes. Adrastus's etiological tale focuses this nexus of pollution in the narrative chain that leads from the Ovidian Medusa's snakes to those of the Ovidian Python and Poine herself, and links Psamathe's sexual violation to Poine's monstrous form and pestilential assault on Argive society. Taken together, all three mythical monsters combine, through the imagery of their cannibalism and mesmerizing effect, to foreshadow the violent end of Cadmus's inward-looking and self-consuming Theban dynasty. For Adrastus, by marrying his daughters to the exiled youths whose violence on his threshold symbolizes the fratricidal war to come between Thebes

and Argos, embroils Argos in the recurrent violence to which Thebes is subject. The crisis of contagion that the female monsters of Adrastus's etiological narrative embody thus spills into the embedding narrative and pollutes his household.

Statius's thematization of this crisis of contagion, manifestly at work in his thematically pointed introduction of the Ovidian Medusa and Python into the Callimachean etiology, extends to the literary level as well.³² For the self-reflexive and intertextual hybridity that is the hallmark of Statian poetic style here (and elsewhere in the epic) finds a compelling analogue in the corporeal hybridity that the monstrous female embodies in the Argive narrative. As is often remarked, ancient literary criticism deployed the vocabulary of the body (*corpus*) and its limbs (*membra*) in the analysis of texts and their parts (see Most 1992; Keith 1999b, both with further bibliography), and in this context the hybrid bodies of the snake-women Medusa and Poine may be seen to reflect Statius's (Ovidian) compositional practice in the *Thebaid* of mixing even such "antithetical" genres as (Callimachean) elegy and (Vergilian) epic in his narrative of Theban fratricide. This is a dark view indeed of the pressures of literary history, but one that furnishes another suggestive model for the intergenerational violence that plagues Cadmus and his descendants in the *Thebaid*.

SILIUS ITALICUS

By comparison with Valerius and Statius, Silius is in some ways the limit-case for my study of the reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in early imperial epic, since his *Punica* develops the historical consequences of the founding myth of Rome elaborated in Vergil's *Aeneid*. As we have seen, Manilius's intense intertextual interest in the Perseus and Andromeda narrative is a very early, but also very powerful, indicator of Ovid's impact on the literature of the principate, and we can trace a similarly early and intense interest in the Perseus and Medusa narrative in the two historical epics of the first century CE. Lucan is our earliest witness here, when in the ninth book of the *Bellum Civile*, he notes that the legend of Medusa "has deceived the centuries" (*"fabula pro vera decepit saecula causa,"* "the story has deceived generations in place of the true cause," BC 9.623). The Neronian epicist attributes the legend to time immemorial, but his extensive lexical and situational debts to Ovid's *Perseid* in his rehearsal of Perseus's killing of Medusa (BC 9.624–83) and flight over Libya (BC 9.684–99), where snakes are thereafter born of her blood (BC 9.700–733)—well discussed by Elaine Fantham (1992a, 110–13, ad loc.) in her

commentary on the passage—implicitly acknowledges the impact of Ovid's mythmaking in the *Metamorphoses*, as does his belittling reference to the legend's widespread diffusion ("volgata per orbem / fabula," "the story, disseminated around the world," BC 9.622–23).

Silius is following both Lucan and Ovid closely in his redaction of the origin of Libya's snakes when he includes the Garamantes in his catalogue of those who fought with Carthage against Rome in Spain (*Pun.* 3.312–16):

quique atro rabidas effervescente veneno
dipsadas immensis horrent Garamantes harenis.
fama docet, caesae rapuit cum Gorgonis ora
Perseus, in Libyam dirum fluxisse cruorem;
inde Medusaeis terram exundasse chelydri.

The Garamantes were there, who shudder at the raging thirst-provoking snakes when their black venom boils over in huge deserts. Report teaches that when Perseus seized the slaughtered Gorgon's head, the dreadful gore dripped over Libya; since then the land has been teeming with Medusa's venomous water-snakes.

Vergil had introduced the Garamantes into Latin epic, but much of Silius's lexicon here is demonstrably Ovidian in inspiration: *effervescere* in the sense of "boil over" appears first at *Metamorphoses* 1.71, while Perseus is described in book 4 (4.699) as "Gorgonis superator" ("the Gorgon's conqueror"; cf. 5.202). The phrase "ora Gorgonis" ("the Gorgon's face") occurs at *Tristia* 4.7.12. Ovid introduced the adjective *Medusaeus* ("Medusan") into Latin (*Met.* 5.257, 312; *Fast.* 5.8). Silius's Ovidian diction constitutes his homage to Vergil's earliest epic successor, whom he recognizes as the source of Lucan's report (*fama*, *Pun.* 3.314 ~ *fabula*, BC 9.623) of the Medusan origins of the Libyan snakes.

A particularly rich example of Silius's concentrated allusion to Ovidian mythmaking occurs in *Punica* 11, when Hannibal and the Carthaginians, encamped in Capua, attend a luxurious banquet modeled on the one Dido gives for Aeneas on his arrival in Carthage. Hannibal is escorted to the place of honor at the banquet, on a high couch bright with purple (*Pun.* 11.272–74): "ipse, deum cultu et sacro dignatus honore, / praecipuis multoque procul splendentibus ostro / accipitur sublime toris" ("Hannibal himself, adorned like a god and received with divine honours, was placed high upon a seat of honor shining especially with much purple"). There enthroned, Hannibal

recalls the sun god himself in *Metamorphoses* 2.23–24, who receives his son wearing purple robes and seated on his high throne: “purpurea velatus veste sedebat / in solio Phoebus claris lucente smaragdis” (“clad in a purple robe, Phoebus sat on his throne gleaming with brilliant emeralds”).³³

During the banquet, moreover, the Capuan bard Teuthras performs for the Carthaginians, seducing them through song to the indulgence of the luxury that will corrupt them over the winter. Richard Bruère (1959, 233) notes the significance of Silius’s introduction of Teuthras’s song (*Pun.* 11.290: “permulcet cantibus aures,” “he soothes their ears with song”), with its echo of Ovid’s description of the song of the Sirens (*Met.* 5.561: “ille canor mulcendas natus ad aures,” “that song, born to soothe the ears”). The Ovidian resonance invites us to see Silius’s singer, and his songs, as Ovidian rather than Vergilian in inspiration, though we can identify a mixed Vergilio-Ovidian debt in the bard’s rehearsal of Jupiter’s “dalliance” with Electra (*Pun.* 11.291–92): “iamque Iovem et laetos per furta caneat amores / Electraeque toros Atlantidos” (“and now he sang of Jove and his fertile love affairs, conducted in secrecy, and the marriage-bed of Atlas’ daughter Electra”). Silius here follows Vergil’s genealogy in *Aeneid* 8, tracing the Trojans’ descent from Atlas’s grandson Dardanus through Atlas’s daughter Electra (*Aen.* 8.134–36): “Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor, / Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus, / advehitur Teucros” (“Dardanus, forefather and founder of the city of Ilion, who was born of Electra as the Greeks report, sailed to the Trojans’ shores”). But the phraseology of Silius’s verses still more specifically recalls Ovid’s reformulation of the Vergilian genealogy in the *Fasti* (4.31–32): “Dardanon Electra nesciret Atlantide cretum / scilicet, Electram concubuisse Iovi?” (“How could he not know that Dardanus was born of Electra, daughter of Atlas, that Electra had lain with Jupiter?”). The erotic lexicon Silius draws on in the passage (e.g., *per furta, amores* and *toros*, *Pun.* 11.291–92), moreover, invites us to remember in addition Jupiter’s many clandestine amatory escapades in *Metamorphoses* 1–3, such as his affairs with Io (whom he tried to conceal from his angry wife by turning her into a cow in book 1), Europa (whom he concealed from his son Mercury in book 2 by turning himself into a bull), and Semele (whom he failed to protect from his angry wife, despite taking up his “second-rank” thunderbolts in book 3). With all of these women he sired sons, as he does here with Electra.

More Ovidian still, however, is Teuthras’s second performance for Hannibal and the Carthaginians, which features an Ovidian theme (the glory of the lyre), developed in Ovidian diction (as Bruère 1959, 233–34, has shown), from

multiple Ovidian models (including the *Fasti* and *Ars amatoria* as well as the *Metamorphoses*), but in a Horatian *persona* (as a lyric bard). The passage begins with a reference to Amphion building the walls of Thebes, a story that Ovid does not tell in his Theban narrative of *Metamorphoses* 3–4. And yet, as Bruère observes (1959, 233–34), “his influence is nevertheless plain. Silius’ *lapidem testudine . . . / ducere* [“drew stones by [the music of] his tortoise-shell”] (11.441–42) recalls Ovid’s Orpheus, who *carmine . . . / saxa sequentia ducit* [“drew the stones which followed by his song”] (*Met.* 11.1–2), together with the *rigidi silices* [“hard flints”] that followed the bard’s song (*Met.* 11.45).”³⁴ Behind the stones that rise to form high towers for Silius’s Amphion, moreover, lies an Ovidian expression from the cosmogony that follows his description of chaos in book 1 of the *Metamorphoses* (1.43–44): “*iussit et extendi campos, subsidere valles, / fronde tegi silvas, lapidosos surgere montes*” (“and he bade the plains be stretched out, the valleys settle, the woods be covered in foliage, and the stony mountains rise”). Ovid’s evocation of chaos will further influence Teuthras’s song some lines later, but immediately after Amphion, Silius mentions Arion (*Pun.* 11.446–48), whose story was famously told by Herodotus in Greek (1.23) and by Ovid in Latin, in the second book of the *Fasti*, where he treats the constellation of the Dolphin (2.79–118). Silius follows the example of Arion with that of Chiron (*Pun.* 11.449–52), Achilles’s tutor not only in martial exercises but also in the art of music, as Ovid recounts at the outset of the *Ars amatoria* (1.11–12).³⁵

In Teuthras’s song, Chiron tames not only Achilles but also the natural world, which introduces a brief cosmogony (*Pun.* 11.453–58), modeled on the song of Silenus in Vergil’s sixth *Eclogue* and the song of Iopas in *Aeneid* 1, but no less indebted to the movement of the first book of the *Metamorphoses* from chaos and cosmogony to the amatory escapades of Apollo and Jupiter, and likewise couched in Ovidian diction. Indeed, Bruère (1959, 234) characterizes these lines as “an epitome of Ovid’s account of the creation in the first book of the *Metamorphoses*.”³⁶ Only after this cosmogonic intrusion does Silius return to his stated theme of the power of the lyric bard, to conclude his song with an expansive account of the exemplary figure of Orpheus (*Pun.* 11.461–80) that alludes in combinatorial fashion to the Orpheus passages of both Vergil (in the fourth *Georgic*) and Ovid (in *Metamorphoses* 10–11) (Bruère 1959, 234–35).

Another iconic figure of Ovidian mythmaking in the *Metamorphoses* (and the *Ars*) is Icarus, the unfortunate son of Daedalus who dies in the course of their aerial escape from Crete. This part of the myth was famously passed over by Vergil in his highly allusive account of Daedalus’s role in Cretan myth

(*Aen.* 6.14–33), recorded by the artisan himself, after his successful escape from Crete, on the doors of the temple to Apollo at Cumae (*Aen.* 6.30–33):

tu quoque magnam
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,
bis patriae cecidere manus.

You too, Icarus, would have a great share in so great a work, did grief allow;
twice he had tried to fashion your fall in gold, and twice his father's hands fell.

Silius takes Hannibal to Cumae in *Punica* 12, where he sees Daedalus's "shining temple" ("fulgentia cernit / arcis templa iugo," *Pun.* 12.85–86) and hears Virrius's account of its construction (*Pun.* 12.88–101):

non est hoc, inquit, nostri, quod suspicis, aevi;
maiores fecere manus. cum regna timeret
Dictaei regis, sic fama est, linquere terras
Daedalus invenit nec toto signa sequenti
orbe dare, aetherias aliena tollere in auras
ausus se penna atque homini monstrare volatus.
suspensum hic Librans media inter nubila corpus
enavit superosque novus conterruit ales.
natum etiam docuit falsae sub imagine plumae
attentare vias volucrum; lapsumque solutis
pennarum remis et non felicibus alis
turbida plaudentem vidit freta; dumque dolori
indulget subito, motis ad pectora palmis,
nescius heu planctu duxit moderante volatus.

"This building which you see above us," he said, "was not the work of our time: it was raised by other hands in ancient days. When Daedalus, as the story goes, feared the power of the Cretan king, he found a way to escape from our world and leave no trace for Minos who pursued him over the whole earth. He dared to ascend the sky on wings not his own and to reveal to mankind the art of flying. Keeping his body poised amid the clouds, he floated on, and the strange winged creature alarmed the gods. He taught his son also to put on a counterfeit semblance of wings and attempt the flight of birds; but

when the feathery oarage melted, he saw him fall and splash the stormy sea
with his ill-starred wings. Yielding to his sudden grief Daedalus beat his breast,
and his blows steered his flight, though he didn't realize it."

The backstory that Daedalus (and Vergil) had left off Apollo's temple doors, Virrius (and Silius) here supply from Ovid's narrative in the eighth book of the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 8.200–202, 217–20, 227–30):

postquam manus ultima coepto
imposita est, geminas opifex libravit in alas
ipse suum corpus motaque pendit in aura . . .
hos aliquis tremula dum captat harundine pisces,
aut pastor baculo stivave innixus arator
vidit et obstipuit, quique aethera carpere possent,
credidit esse deos . . .
tabuerant cerae: nudos quatit ille lacertos,
remigioque carens non ullas percipit auras,
oraeque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen
excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo.

After the finishing touches had been set to the undertaking, the master workman himself balanced his body on two wings and hung poised on the beaten air. . . . Now some fisherman sees them, angling for fish with his flexible rod, or a shepherd leaning on his staff, or a plowman on his plow-handles, and stands stupefied, and believes them to be gods that they could fly through the air. . . . The wax melted; his arms were bare as he beat them up and down, but, lacking wings, they took no hold on the air. His mouth, calling to the last his father's name, was drowned in the dark blue sea, which took its name from him.

Bruère catalogues Silius's lexical debts to Ovid in the *Punica* (cf. Bruère 1959, 235–36): the Silian Daedalus's flight (12.92–95) adapts the Ovidian Daedalus's trial of his new wings (*Met.* 8.201–2); the Silian Daedalus terrifies the gods, who mistake him for a strange new bird, reversing the amazement of Ovid's fishermen, who take Daedalus and Icarus for gods (*Met.* 8.217–20). The Silian Daedalus beats his breast in grief over his son's death, in lines that echo the Ovidian Icarus's vain beating of his wings when the sun has melted the wax that held them together. Silius thus renovates a Vergilian structure to put on

display his Ovidian mythological learning. Once again, a Flavian epicist invites us to read ecphrasis as a figure for the emblematic status of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as a literary artifact in his day. Here too, moreover, as with Statius's embossed Argive bowl, we see the complicated intertwining of Ovidian myth with Vergilian narrative (and artistic) structure. Indeed, it is striking that both Statius and Silius redecorate Vergilian objects with Ovidian myths; and it is tempting to read this nexus of allusion and ecphrasis as recognition of Ovid's consummate artistry in his redaction of classical myth in the *Metamorphoses*.³⁷

Silius's historical epic, then, like the mythological epics of Valerius and Statius, offers tangible evidence of the specifically Ovidian currency of the world of Greco-Roman myth in the Flavian period. The individual myths of Perseus and Medusa, Orpheus and his lyre, and Daedalus and Icarus were all given their canonical form by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*, and have afterlives that last well beyond antiquity. Yet even in Silius's sequel to Vergil's Dido narrative, we can see the literary and thematic pressure that the extra-Vergilian myths of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* bring to bear on the Flavian historical epicist's Vergilian narrative—not necessarily to deform the Vergilian vision, but to deepen and supplement the master's work.

NOTES

I am grateful to Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover for the invitation to participate in the Langford Conference on Repetition in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in February 2013, and for stimulating discussions with colleagues on that occasion. Special thanks to Antony Augoustakis, Laurel Fulkerson, Stephen Hinds, Sharon James, Carole Newlands, and Tim Stover for their comments on early versions of this chapter. I alone am responsible for any errors that remain.

1. "However, Ovid rarely declaimed *controversiae* ["disputations"], and only ones involving portrayal of character. He preferred *suasoriae* ["speeches of advice"], finding all argumentation tiresome. He used language by no means over-freely except in his poetry, where he was well aware of his faults—and enjoyed them. What can make this clear is that once, when he was asked by his friends to suppress three of his lines, he asked in return to be allowed to make an exception of three over which they should have no rights. This seemed a fair condition. They wrote in private the lines they wanted removed, while he wrote the ones he wanted saved. The sheets of both contained the same verses. Albinovanus Pedo, who was among those present, tells that the first of them was: "Half-bull man and half-man bull" ["semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem," *Ars am.* 2.24]; the second "Freezing north wind and de-freezing south" ["et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum," *Am.* 2.11.10]. It is clear from this that the great man lacked not the judgment but the will to restrain the license of his poetry.

He used sometimes to say that a face is the more beautiful for some mole." Translations throughout are from the Loeb editions of the texts.

2. Note especially *Am.* 2.18.24, "Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant" ("let Hippolytus's father and Hippolytus read"), with genealogical and verbal repetition of the first *hemiepes* in the second. The authenticity of the double *Heroides* has been questioned, notably by Fischer (1969) and Reeve (1973). More recently, however, Kenney (1979) has argued strongly in favor of Ovidian authorship; see the introduction to Kenney's 1996 Cambridge commentary on the double *Heroides*. Latin quotations are from Housman 1927 (Lucan), Mynors 1958 (Catullus), Mynors 1969 (Vergil), Alton, Wormell, and Courtney 1978 (Ovid's *Fasti*), Ehlers 1980 (Valerius Flaccus), Hill 1983 (Statius's *Thebaid*), Delz 1987 (Silius), Kenney 1995 (Ovid's *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*), Goold 1998 (Manilius), and Tarrant 2004 (Ovid's *Metamorphoses*).

3. On thematic repetition in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see, e.g., N. G. G. Davis 1980; Crabbe 1981; Hardie 2004. On intratextuality in the *Fasti*, see Newlands 2000.

4. This feature of Ovid's poetry is perhaps most visible in his recursion to the *Amores* in the *Ars amatoria* and to the *Ars amatoria* in the *Remedia amoris*, on which see, e.g., Fränkel 1945, 67–72; Hollis 1973, 101–4; Sharrock 1994b; and, especially, Sharrock 2002b. For Ovid's continuing recuperations of Medea, see Hinds 1993; for his reception of the *Metamorphoses* in the exile poetry, see Hinds 1999 and chapter 7 in this volume, by Peter Knox.

5. On Manilius, see Volk 2002 and 2009; Green and Volk 2011. On Manilius's Ovid, see Wheeler 2009; and on Manilius's Perseus and Andromeda epyllion, see Uden 2011. All have further bibliography.

6. On this phenomenon in connection with Seneca, cf. Hinds 2011.

7. On Lucan's reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see Wheeler 2002b; Keith 2011; both have further bibliography. On Silius's reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (and *Fasti*), see Bruère 1958 and 1959; Wilson 2004.

8. This section of my chapter draws on Keith 2014a.

9. The adjective is from Zissos 2008, xxxix; cf. Feeney 1991, 315–37; Malamud and McGuire 1993; Barchiesi 2001, 317–20; Hershkowitz 1998, *passim*.

10. Zissos 2008, 153: "The initial treatment of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis is systematically indebted to *Met.* 11.221–65, in which Peleus rapes Thetis in a sea cavern. Without adopting the rape narrative itself . . . VF incorporates many details from the Ovidian account: Thetis' aversion to marriage to Peleus, her conveyance to her future husband on a dolphin, and her knowledge of the oracle that she would beget a son greater than his father. The intertextual debt is carefully marked [cf. *Met.* 11.224]. The final panel, featuring the Battle of Lapiths and Centaurs, draws heavily upon the detailed, parodic account at *Met.* 12.210–535. Like Ovid, VF makes the use of incongruous weapons—bowls, goblets, tables, and altars—a central element of the account, and exploits the hybrid nature of the centaurs to enhance the bizarreness of the scene."

11. On Valerius's "overripened" Ovidian landscapes, including that in which Hesion is exposed, cf. Slaney 2014, in Skempis and Ziogas 2014. On the etymological geography of amatory concealment in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, cf. Ziogas 2014, in Skempis and Ziogas 2014.

12. On rape (or attempted rape) in the *Metamorphoses*, and its repeated use as a structural feature of the poem, see chapter 6 in this volume, by Sharon James; see also Curran 1978; Richlin 1992. On the conjunction of violence and desire in Ovid's landscapes, see Parry 1964; Segal 1969; Hinds 2002, 130–36; Newlands 2004.

13. "auxerat haec locus et facies maestissima capti / litoris et tumuli caelumque quod incubat urbi, / quale laborantis Nemees iter aut Erymanthi / vidit et infectae miseratus flumina Lernae." ("The place lent strength to her words, the doleful aspect too of the captive shore, the funeral pyres and the sky that brooded over the city; even such to his pitying eyes had seemed the path to Nemea and Erymanthus and Lerna's poisoned meres," Val. Flacc. *Argon.* 2.493–96.)

14. First at Callim. *Hymn* 3 145 (Greek) and Verg. *Ed.* 7.61 (Latin); cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.414; 6.123, 392, 801; 8.203, 219, 249, 256, 363; 10.321, 461, 464; Ov. *Met.* 9.13, 51, 110, 217; 11.213; 12.538.

15. On the Ovidian ecphrasis, see Hardie 2002, 178–86; 2004.

16. "regem inde petens superabat ovanti / litora tuta gradu, qualis per pascua victor / ingreditur, tum colla tumens, tum celsior armis / taurus, ubi adsueta pectoris stabula alta revisit / et patrium nemus et bello quos ultus amores." ("Thence with triumphant steps he passes across the safe shore to meet the king; just as a victorious bull advances through the pastures, his neck swelling and his shoulders loftier, when he returns to the high fold of the accustomed herd, his native glade and his love, whom he has avenged in battle," *Argon.* 2.545–49.)

17. "nec mos bellantis una stabulare, sed alter / victus abit longeque ignotis exsulat oris, / multa gemens ignominiam plagasque superbi / victoris, tum quos amisit inultus amores, / et stabula aspectans regnis excessit avitis." ("Nor is it the custom for the rivals to herd together, but the vanquished bull departs and dwells far away, an exile on unknown shores, lamenting many things—his shame, the blows of the arrogant victor, and the love he has lost unavenged—and then with a wistful glance at his stall, he departed from his ancestral realm," *G.* 3.224–28.)

18. On Ovid's treatment of the rape of Proserpina, see Hinds 1987; 2002.

19. On this trope in Latin epic, see Keith 2000, 36–64.

20. This section draws on material discussed in Keith 2004–5.

21. In an important analysis of Ovid's *Thebaid*, Philip Hardie (1990) has identified as one of its most prominent themes the repeated "opposition between city and wilderness" (quotation on 231); other major themes Hardie discusses are human impiety and the vengeance of the gods, blindness and insight, and recognition and reversal—all in the context of the sacrificial relations that structure both classical tragedy and Vergil's ktistic epic. On Ovid's Theban narrative, see Feldherr 1997; Janan 2009.

22. On wandering as both deviation and error in Statius's *Thebaid*, cf. Parkes 2013 in Augoustakis 2013. This section of my chapter draws on material discussed in Keith 2014b; I am grateful to Marios Skempis and Ioannis Ziogas for permission to use it here.

23. Statius applies the adjective *Sidonius* ("from Sidon," "Tyrian") to Europa and the bull that ravished her (*Theb.* 1.5, 181), Cadmus (3.180, 300), and their country of origin (8.229; 11.212; cf. 10.648); thence he applies it to Thebes and the Thebans (3.656; 4.648; 7.442–43, 600; 8.218, 330, 686; 9.144, 567, 709; 10.126, 297, 480–81; 11.303). The adjective is frequent in Ovid, who also coined the feminine adjectival form *Sidonis* ("woman of Sidon," "Tyrian"), which Statius uses of Europa (*Theb.* 9.334): see *OLD* s.v.

24. For the rarity of the adjective, see Bömer 1969, 49, ad loc.

25. "Inachias . . . urbes" ("Argive cities" or "cities on the river Inachus," Verg. *Aen.* 11.286).

26. Significantly, Callimachus includes both myths in his *Hecale* (fr. 59–60 and 90 Hollis). Statius thus here offers a brief Callimachean itinerary inset within a more expansive Ovidian narrative program.

27. In this section I draw on material in Keith 2013.

28. Heuvel (1932, 283) notes the model that Dido's reception of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1 affords Statius in this passage; cf. Caviglia 1973, 147, on *Theb.* 1.543; Bernstein 2008, 76–77. Caviglia also notes Statius's debt at *Theb.* 1.541–51 to *Aen.* 1.728–56 (misprinted as "782").

29. See Keith 2004–5 on the importance of Ovid's Theban narrative in *Metamorphoses* 3–4 to Statius's *Thebaid*.

30. Significantly, the origin of the snakes in Libya is explained as deriving from the blood that dripped from Medusa's head as Perseus flew over the landscape (*Met.* 4.716–20, quoted in text). The etiology appears already in Apollonius's *Argonautica* (4.1513–17) and is no doubt inspired in dialogue with Callimachus's *Aetia*. On the Apollonian passage, see Livrea 1973, 422–23; on etiology in the *Metamorphoses*, see Myers 1994a.

31. Heuvel (1932, 244) notes that Statius's Python is recognizably related not only to Ovid's Delphic interloper but also, even more ominously, to the snake of Mars, which Cadmus kills to found the city of Thebes at the outset of Ovid's *Thebaid* (*Met.* 3.31–49). Again, therefore, we can see Ovid's Theban narrative exerting pressure on the design of Statius's introductory movement in what we might call a Theban deformation of Argos (or Delphi, in this case).

32. On Statius's poetic commitments in the *Thebaid*, see Gossage 1959; Hardie 1989; Hardie 1993, 88–119; P. Davis 1994; Keith 2002; Keith 2004–5; McNelis 2007, *passim*.

33. Wilson (2004, 230) notes Silius's debt to the Ovidian myth of Phaethon in the speech in which the Capuan Pacuvius tries to dissuade his son Perolla from assassinating Hannibal (*Pun.* 11.329–54), recalling the Ovidian sun god's efforts to persuade his son Phaethon not to drive the solar chariot (*Met.* 2.49–104).

34. Wilson (2004, 232–34) discusses Silius's sophisticated contamination of Vergil's Orpheus narrative with Ovid's.

35. On Silius's predilection for presenting internal narratives and musical performances in Ovidian style, see Wilson 2004, 229.

36. Bruère 1959, 234: "The Ovidian '*Chaos, rudis indigestaque moles*' ['chaos, a rough, unordered mass of things'] (*Met.* 1.7) has been taken over with little change; like Silius, the earlier poet had stressed the absence of sun and moon (*ibid.* 10–11) and the universal darkness: *lucis egens aer* ['the air devoid of light'] (*ibid.* 17). Teuthras' *deus* who resolves the confusion is the *deus et melior . . . natura* ['God—or kindlier Nature'] of the *Metamorphoses* (1.21), and his description of the separation of the elements recalls with verbal similarities: '*nam caelo terras et terris abscidit undas / et liquidum spisso secrevit ab aere caelum*' ['for he rent asunder land from sky, and sea from land, and separated the ethereal heavens from the dense atmosphere'] (*Met.* 1.22–23), just as the statement of the central location of the terrestrial globe is an amalgam of Ovid's: '*tellus / ponderibus librata suis*' ['the earth, poised by her own weight'] (*Met.* 1.12–13) with '*terram . . . / . . . magni speciem glomeravit in orbis*' ['he molded the earth into the form of a mighty ball'] (*ibid.* 34–35); finally the assignation of Olympus (the heavens) as the abode of the gods (457) derives from the same poet's: '*astra tenent caeleste solum formaeque deorum*' ['the stars and divine forms occupied the floor of heaven'] (*Met.* 1.73)." Bracketed translations are mine.

37. Wilson (2004, 234) draws attention to Silius's interest in Ovidian statements of artistic immortality, connecting Silius's reinterpretation of the Orpheus myth (through his radical contamination of the Vergilian with the Ovidian Orpheus) with Ovid's own claim of artistic immortality in the final lines of the *Metamorphoses* (15.875–76).

Revisiting Ovidian Silius, along with Lucretian, Vergilian, and Lucanian Silius

NEIL W. BERNSTEIN

Silius Italicus's seventeen-book epic *Punica* was condemned in older scholarship for its putative lack of originality. Such a verdict has correctly been deemed unfair, and the poem has more recently attracted a sympathetic and attentive scholarly audience.¹ Though Silius, like the other Flavian epic poets, may have adapted scenes from his predecessors, his invention on the verbal level appeared to be his own. In a classic article, Marcus Wilson (2004, 225, 226n3) makes the following observation about Silius's allusive practices:

Compared with other writers of Latin epic, [Silius] tends to eschew signposting his intertexts by the technique of "quotation," that is, by repeating complete phrases or other word collocations from earlier poems. He prefers to signal the intertextual connection by alternative means, in particular, by coincidence of situation and detail rather than wording and, occasionally, by more explicit hints. . . . Hence computer word searches are of limited value in the study of Silian allusion. There are, of course, exceptions to Silius' avoidance of embedded quotation where he does use tell-tale phrases from earlier writers.

Analysis of intertextuality has long been the dominant mode of inquiry in the study of Latin poetry.² Though the degree of intentionality in any given intertext has given rise to sharp debate,³ almost all would agree that direct quotation or adaptation of word collocations represents only one of a poet's numerous strategies for mobilizing the texts of his predecessors in his own new work. At a minimum, well-known allusive resources identifiable in any Latin poet include (a) verbal substitution; (b) calques on Greek phrases; and (c) broader thematic similarities that transcend individual verbal correspondences.⁴ While

a quotation may certainly signpost an allusion, it is not the only way to create a linkage between texts. Following Wilson's lead, however, I shall focus primarily on quotation in the first part of this chapter. I have employed the freely available *Tesserae* project (tesserae.caset.buffalo.edu) in order to assemble both quantitative and qualitative evidence to test the comparative claim that Silius repeats complete phrases and word collocations less frequently than other Latin epic poets, with a focus on repetition from Ovid.

Though helpful in revealing overall patterns of quotation in the Latin epic poets, such quantitative assessments have philological limitations. Wilson's "signposting" refers to interpretatively meaningful repetitions of phrases found in earlier poems. Not every high-scoring hit generated by the *Tesserae* project necessarily represents an interpretatively significant linkage between texts. Some may be uses of the same vocabulary without any conceptual link. Therefore, I complement the presentation of the quantitative results with a qualitative assessment of patterns of quotation in book 2 of the *Punica* as part of my ongoing research for a philological commentary on this book of epic. I examine how Silius juxtaposes the full range of allusion to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (i.e., beyond simple text reuse) with allusion to other epic poets, including his Flavian contemporaries, in order to put the Ovidian allusions into a broader context.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Tesserae (tesserae.caset.buffalo.edu) is a search program developed by Neil Coffee, Christopher Forstall, and a team at the University at Buffalo. It lists all matches of two-lexeme phrases in a database of more than three hundred poetic and prose texts from the Greco-Roman literary corpus (Coffee et al. 2012a, 2012b).⁵ A scoring feature then automatically assigns a score to each match by applying a formula accounting for the distance between the matched lexemes in the parallel contexts and the frequency of their occurrence in the source and target texts. Scores fall between 1 and 11 on a natural logarithmic scale.⁶ Pairs of less common words that appear closer together will score higher than more common words that appear further apart. Scores reflect textual "gravity": a rare word has more "weight" than a common one, and words that occur close together in both source and target texts are similarly accorded more "weight." Therefore a high-scoring match is more likely to be interpretatively significant, as rarer words occurring close together are more likely to result in meaningful allusion than common words occurring far apart.

Some specific examples of the *Tesserae* scoring system in action follow. *Tesserae* assigns a score of 10 to the matched lexemes “singultantem animam” at Silius’s *Punica* 2.362 and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 5.134. The high score reflects (a) the comparative rarity of the lexemes *anima* (“soul, breath, life”) and *singulto* (“sob, gasp”) and (b) the proximity of the words in both phrases. The words are adjacent in both loci.⁷ By contrast, *Tesserae* assigns a score of 5 to the following matched pair of lexemes: “*ipsa* meum *vidi* lacerato vulnere nostras / terrentem Murrum noctes” (“I myself saw my husband Murrus terrifying my nights with his mangled body,” *Pun.* 2.562–63) ~ “*ipse* ego, ne dubites, adero praesensque *videbor*” (“I myself will be there, don’t doubt it, and I will be present and visible,” *Met.* 14.727). The lexemes *ipse*, *ipsa*, *ipsum* and *video*, *videre* occur very commonly in the Latin language, and the words in the phrases from the *Punica* and the *Metamorphoses* do not occur closely together in the paired lines. The low score suggests what most human readers would likely conclude: that in spite of the shared vocabulary, there is no meaningful connection between these lines, because the vocabulary is not distinctive; nor does the context suggest a conceptual overlap.⁸ Most low-scoring matches reflect nothing more significant than the fact that both source and target text have been written in Latin. Long experience with *Tesserae* suggests that scores of 7–10 capture the best set of meaningful correspondences between source and target texts. Matches that receive a *Tesserae* score below 7 have accordingly been ignored in this study.

This study compares the rates of reuse of phrases from the *Metamorphoses* in the *Punica* to a wide assortment of other hexameter texts, from Lucretius’s *De rerum natura* through selected works of late antiquity.⁹ Each source text was compared with every later target text. Using *Tesserae*’s batch processing feature,¹⁰ we analyzed the *Metamorphoses* as a *target* text for earlier works by Lucretius, Horace, and Vergil,¹¹ and as a *source* text for later works by Manilius, Lucan, the Flavian poets, and so forth. We then collected *Tesserae* results from a comparison of 276 pairs of texts, 24 of which involve the *Metamorphoses*. *Tesserae* scores from 7 through 11 were collected for each pair of texts (table 9.1).

The texts examined in this analysis vary greatly in length, from Vergil’s ten brief *Eclogues* (approximately 5,600 words) to the fifteen books of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (approximately 78,000 words). There are more opportunities in a longer text than in a shorter one to reuse distinctive phrases from the prior poetic tradition. Conversely, a longer source text provides more phrases for subsequent poets to reuse. There will accordingly be a correlation

TABLE 9.1. Selected *Tesserae* results using Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as source text

Target text	Score					All hits scored 7 +
	11 hits	10 hits	9 hits	8 hits	7 hits	
Manilius, <i>Astronomica</i>	0	39	466	2,366	8,646	11,517
Persius, <i>Satires</i>	0	6	22	161	797	986
Lucan, <i>Bellum Civile</i>	6	131	966	3,936	16,737	21,776
<i>Ilias Latina</i> ^a	0	14	74	662	2,497	3,247
Valerius Flaccus, <i>Argonautica</i>	1	75	622	2,899	12,279	15,876
Statius, <i>Thebaid</i>	4	165	1,015	5,002	19,745	25,931
Statius, <i>Achilleid</i>	0	7	78	639	2,330	3,054
Silius Italicus, <i>Punica</i>	5	284	1,564	6,621	24,950	33,424
Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>	0	37	328	1,685	6,383	8,433
Juvenius, <i>Historia evangelica</i>	0	20	235	1,420	5,307	6,982
Ausonius, <i>Mosella</i>	1	6	26	135	814	982
Claudian, <i>De raptu Proserpinae</i>	0	9	97	548	1,971	2,625
Claudian, <i>De quarto consulatu Honorii Augusti</i>	0	5	29	260	992	1,286
Claudian, <i>De bello Gildonico</i>	0	3	23	192	775	993
Claudian, <i>De consulatu Stilichonis</i>	0	10	84	597	2,073	2,764
Corippus, <i>Johannis</i>	0	29	515	2,604	9,569	12,717

^a For the work's possible Neronian date, see *New Pauly*, s.v. *Ilias Latina*.

between the raw *Tesserae* scores (provided in table 9.1) and the lengths of the source and target texts in question. We would expect Silius's seventeen-book *Punica* (approximately 76,000 words) to reuse more distinctive phrases from Ovid's fifteen-book *Metamorphoses* than, say, from the fragmentary *Achilleid* (approximately 7,200 words), simply because the *Punica* and the *Metamorphoses* are both very long poems. The raw scores are therefore not meaningful in themselves.

A detailed statistical analysis developed by Wei Lin (Department of Mathematics, Ohio University) permitted the translation of the raw-score results into a measure of the *intensity* of engagement between target texts and sources. Every text in this group of 276 pairs is in Latin hexameters, and thus is a priori more likely to reuse particular fixed phrases from earlier tradition than texts in other metrical forms or in prose. The meaningful result is accordingly the amount of text reuse that a target text displays over and above the baseline for hexameter text reuse among the 276 pairs. We first calculated the expected count of reuse for a pair of texts based on their length, and then subtracted this expected count from the observed count to determine a residual count. The residual count signifies the frequency of instances of high-scoring lexeme matches that appear above the frequency that one would expect based simply upon the length of the source and target texts. Larger positive residuals signify a higher than expected rate of text reuse (expectations in this sense are based on the length of texts, not their content or literary history), and larger negative residuals signify a less than expected rate. Our longer study examines every text in the hexameter tradition as source or target for every other. The quantitative section of this chapter presents the results of this study relevant to the *Punica* (table 9.2) and the *Metamorphoses* (table 9.3, given later).

Table 9.2 quantifies the intensity of Silius's engagement with his predecessors in hexameter poetry. The source texts are ranked in descending order of residual score. A number of the entries in the table express the traditional understanding of the relationship between texts in the Latin hexameter tradition. The truism universally repeated about Silius's intertextuality concerns his intense engagement with the works of Vergil. At one time, this was a principal reason for Latinists to dismiss the poet as a mere imitator (see Dominik 2010). According to the objective measure provided here, the poem's reuse of the distinctive phrases of Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics* is indeed more substantial than for any other hexameter work on the list. At the bottom end of the table, the evidence of a relative lack of engagement between the *Punica* and satiric and didactic hexameter again offers support for the soundness of the method employed here. The *Punica* employs a higher linguistic register to discuss subjects that are largely distinct from the pedestrian vocabulary and everyday concerns of the hexameter works of Horace and the *Satires* of Persius. Accordingly, the distinctive collocations in each of these texts are much less likely to match those of the *Punica*, as reflected in their negative residual counts.

The linguistic register may be closer for the didactic hexameter of Manilius's *Astronomica* and Lucretius's *De rerum natura*, but it is still more distant

TABLE 9.2. Residual counts for Silius's *Punica* and preceding source texts

Source text	Residual count
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i>	1.928
Vergil, <i>Georgics</i>	1.546
<i>Ilias Latina</i>	1.545
Statius, <i>Achilleid</i>	1.462
Ovid, <i>Metamorphoses</i>	0.520
Lucan, <i>Bellum Civile</i>	0.450
Vergil, <i>Eclogues</i>	0.332
Valerius Flaccus, <i>Argonautica</i>	0.272
Statius, <i>Thebaid</i>	0.204
Manilius, <i>Astronomica</i>	-0.046
Lucretius, <i>De rerum natura</i>	-0.329
Horace, <i>Ars poetica</i>	-0.697
Horace, <i>Satires</i>	-0.731
Persius, <i>Satires</i>	-0.823
Horace, <i>Epistles</i>	-1.208

than that of other mythological or historical epic. The didactic epics' residual counts are close to zero, which indicates that they match the expected rate of reuse for any two hexameter texts of comparable length in the index. To produce a residual count either substantially higher or substantially lower than zero, the *Punica* must make much more, or much less, frequent use of the distinctive phrases of a predecessor's text than the norm for texts of comparable length. As we might expect based on the traditional account of the difference between the genres, this level of engagement or nonengagement does not tend to occur with either didactic or satiric hexameter.

The conformity between the statistical analysis and the traditional narrative offers a measure of confidence in the method. By proceeding from the familiar to the less well known, we may be able to draw tentative conclusions about the results in the middle ranks of the table. These data tell a less extreme but equally straightforward story. Silius's next most important predecessors after Vergil in Latin hexameter are Ovid and Lucan. He uses these poets' distinctive phrases less frequently than those of the *Aeneid* and *Georgics*, but still significantly more than the norm for this index of hexameter works.¹² The similarity of their residual counts makes it hard to state with confidence which poet's phrases are more significant to Silius, as both appear to be of roughly equal

importance to the composition of the *Punica*. The higher residual counts for reuse of the major Flavian epics may point to concurrent composition. Current *communis opinio* regarding the Flavian epics' relative periods of composition assumes that Silius had completed a substantial amount of the *Punica* when Statius was writing his final work (see Ripoll 2015). Raymond Marks (2014) speaks of "bi-directional influence" with regard to the earlier *Thebaid*. The high residual count of Statius's *Achilleid* may therefore represent a similar situation of concurrent composition.

Multiple reuse is an important consideration to bear in mind in assessing the significance of residual counts. The example of the collocation *sanguin*-* ("blood") + *vena* ("vein"), a frequently occurring clausula in Latin hexameter, can illustrate some of the issues involved. It is first attested in Latin hexameter at Lucretius's *De rerum natura* 3.442, in a discussion of the mortality of the soul, and then adapted in a wide variety of contexts by successive poets, including Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, and Silius.¹³ The occurrences of the distinctive phrase in each text pair receive high *Tesserae* scores (usually 8 or 9), because the words *sanguis* and *vena* are comparatively rare in themselves and always occur together in this clausula. *Tesserae* simply registers all instances of reuse and does not currently have the means of identifying the originator of a particular distinctive phrase. It therefore assigns a high-scoring count for each of these matches in each paired text.¹⁴ So even though we might think of each successive occurrence of *sanguin*-* *vena* as ultimately dependent on Lucretius, *Tesserae* counts as if the occurrences in Vergil, Ovid, and Lucan all served as equally relevant sources for the occurrence in Silius's *Punica*. Exclusion of intermediary occurrences is not currently part of the *Tesserae* project's functionality. Such exclusion may not be desirable, in fact, as the Latin poets frequently engage in what Richard Thomas (1986) called "window reference": allusion in which one phrase evokes both an intermediary text and a more distant source.¹⁵

We may accordingly draw the following tentative conclusions in regard to the relative intensity of Silius's reuse of the distinctive phrases of his predecessors. In descending order of confidence:

1. The *Punica* reuses phrases from Vergil's *Aeneid* and the *Georgics* more frequently than those from any other hexameter source.
2. Reuse of non-epic hexameter, such as didactic and satiric, generally occurs at significantly lower rates in the *Punica* than would be predicted based on the lengths of the texts.

3. The *Punica* makes substantial reuse of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, at roughly similar rates, though the frequency of reuse is not as high as for Vergil's major works.
4. The poet's reuse of the work of his Flavian contemporaries is at a lower level than for Augustan or Neronian epic. The unexpectedly high residual score of Statius's *Achilleid* may represent a case of bi-directional influence due to concurrent composition.

In keeping with the theme of this book, I conclude the quantitative analysis section with a consideration of the reuse of Ovidian phrases across the subsequent hexameter tradition. Table 9.3 presents residual counts for Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as a source for sixteen post-Augustan hexameter texts. The presence of the *Satires* of Juvenal and Persius and the epics of late antiquity (Juvencus and Corippus) at the bottom of the table again supplies a degree of confidence in the results. The unexpectedly high residual counts of Ausonius's *Mosella* and the *Ilias Latina* can perhaps be partly explained as the effect of multiple reuse. All three texts are deeply engaged with Vergil's works as well as Ovid's.¹⁶ The most interesting results from this study of Ovid's reception across the subsequent hexameter tradition appear in the seeming distinction between historical and mythological epic.¹⁷ Though they may discuss a different set of topics, Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and Silius's *Punica* appear to be more intensely engaged with Ovid's distinctive phrases than are the mythological epics such as Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica*, Statius's *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, and Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae*. It accordingly appears that Wilson's designation of Silius as an Ovidian was also accurate in objective terms of text reuse.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS: MULTITIERED ALLUSION

As the preceding discussion indicates, the results of *Tesserae* must be weighed as well as counted. The quantitative analysis made possible by *Tesserae* helps to illustrate the larger context of the reception tradition, and allows tentative claims to be made regarding the relationship between a work, its sources, and its predecessors. *Tesserae* can also assist traditional qualitative analysis, though any study of text reuse based on lexeme matching is subject to the limitations described in the introduction to this chapter. As an example, I have chosen Silius's description of the famine at Saguntum, which resulted from the prolonged siege of the city by Hannibal's forces (*Pun.* 2.461–74).

TABLE 9.3. Residual counts for Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as source for subsequent target texts

<i>Target text</i>	<i>Residual count</i>
Ausonius, <i>Mosella</i>	3.830
<i>Ilias Latina</i>	2.565
Lucan, <i>Bellum Civile</i>	0.850
Silius Italicus, <i>Punica</i>	0.520
Claudian, <i>De raptu Proserpinae</i>	0.319
Statius, <i>Achilleid</i>	0.276
Statius, <i>Thebaid</i>	0.131
Claudian, <i>De consulatu Stilichonis</i>	0.060
Valerius Flaccus, <i>Argonautica</i>	-0.020
Claudian, <i>De quarto consulatu Honorii Augusti</i>	-0.077
Claudian, <i>De bello Gildonico</i>	-0.197
Manilius, <i>Astronomica</i>	-0.228
Corippus, <i>Johannis</i>	-0.302
Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>	-0.843
Juvencus, <i>Historia evangelica</i>	-0.877
Persius, <i>Satires</i>	-1.353

sedet acta medullis

iamdudum atque inopes penitus coquit intima pestis.

est furtim lento misere durantia tabo

viscera et exurit siccatas sanguine venas

per longum celata fames. iam lumina retro

exesis fugere genis, iam lurida sola

tecta cute et venis male iuncta trementibus ossa

exstant consumptis visu deformia membris.

umentis rores noctis terramque madentem

solamen fecere mali cassoque labore

e sicco frustra presserunt robore sucos.

nil temerare piget; rabidi ieiunia ventris

insolitis adigunt vesci, resolutaque nudos

linquentes clipeos armorum tegmina mandunt.

A plague long since permeating their marrows rests inside them and roasts the helpless people from deep within. Hunger concealed for a long while secretly

eats away their innards, hardening wretchedly with slow disease, and parches their dried-up, bloodless veins. And now their eyes retreat back from their wasted cheeks. Now their limbs have been eaten away and their bones protrude, disgusting to see, scarcely joined to palpitating blood vessels and covered only by lurid skin. They made the moist night's dew and the damp earth the consolation for their suffering, and in vain they squeezed sap from dry wood with fruitless labor. There is nothing they are ashamed to violate. Their rabid stomachs' hunger leads them to eat unfamiliar food. They loosen the covers of their shields and leave them bare as they gnaw on the straps.

Though brief, this passage illustrates the poet's multitiered allusive practice.¹⁸ Table 9.4 presents a summary of the current state of knowledge, listing each of the hexameter sources included in François Spaltenstein's (1986) standard commentary on the *Punica*. Boldface and underlining represent verbal correspondences; thematic correspondences have no markup; and nonhexameter parallels are listed in footnote b.

Judicious use of *Tesserae* allows the commentator to rapidly add to the stock of *loci similes*. Tables 9.5–9.7 offer a qualitative perspective on the relative importance of Ovid as a verbal resource for this passage of the *Punica*. The tables present a series of interpretatively meaningful matches between the passage and a selection of pre-Ovidian, Ovidian, and post-Ovidian hexameter texts. The *Tesserae* scores for each match are included, demonstrating how the scoring function can help the user to narrow down the results to a usable set. I include only a carefully edited selection of these results, however, as many high-scoring *Tesserae* matches do not meet the ordinary reader's definition of an interpretatively significant connection.¹⁹

These lines containing matched pairs of lexemes offer a variety of interpretative leads. Through its evocation of Ariadne's calls of distress at her abandonment by Theseus in Catullus 64, the pairing *medulla* ("marrow") + *inops* ("helpless") initiates a series of overlaps between the description of the Saguntines' suffering from famine and plague and the erotic tradition's topoi for the suffering of lovers.²⁰ The collocation *penitus* ("deep within") + *pestis* ("plague") continues the overlap with erotic language,²¹ and creates an additional association with Vergil's underworld plagues. Instances of repetition with less extensive morphological variation include Silius's adaptation of the Vergilian phrases "solamenque mali"²² ("consolation of evil") and "armorumque resoluit / tegmina" ("loosed their arms' covering"), and the Lucretian description of the futility of human labor "in cassum frustra laborat" ("labors

to no purpose and in vain"). Other *Tesserae* lexeme matches on this list merely reflect the well-known fact that the Latin poets frequently combine words from the same semantic field in association. This compositional strategy accounts for the pairing of "guts and blood" (*viscera, sanguis*), already anticipated by Spaltenstein in his citation of Statius's *Thebaid* 4.734–35 (*viscera, cruor*).

My assignment of the phrase "consumed limbs" ("consumpta membra") to Lucretius is intended to make a point about the undecidability of the point of origination of distinctive phrases. Lucretius is the first attested Latin author to use the words "consumed limbs" together, in the context of the world's perpetual degeneration and regeneration. Most readers would agree that Ovid's "consumptaque membra senecta" ("limbs consumed by old age," *Met.* 14.148) is a far closer thematic parallel to Silius's account of the effects of the Saguntine famine, as it similarly describes the deterioration of a human body. Yet it is impossible to know whether Ovid consciously adapted the phrase from Lucretius or created it from his own inspiration. The Elder Seneca attests to Ovid's participation in the same schools as the other declaimers recalled in his ten books of *Controversiae*. Did Ovid remember the phrase from Vibius Gallus's "intuemini debilia infelicium membra nescio qua tunc consumpta" ("look at the wretches' debilitated limbs, consumed by I don't know what kind of disease," *Controv.* 10.4.3)? The challenge of deciding which of his predecessors Silius chose to adapt to describe his starving Saguntines is further complicated when we consider Pseudo-Seneca's portrait of a dying Hercules, the founder of Saguntum: "praebuit . . . sua membra flammis, / tunc consumptus" ("he gave his limbs to the flames, consumed by poison," *Med.* 640–41; cf. [Sen.] *HO* 1357–58). The only defensible position appears to be charity combined with agnosticism (see Farrell 2005). There is no reason to assume that Silius did not read each of these preceding texts, and no reason to assume that any particular text supplied the material for conscious adaptation.

Table 9.6 presents results from a *Tesserae* analysis using the entire Ovidian corpus as sources (including the elegiac works as well as the *Metamorphoses*) and the passage from *Punica* 2 as the target. As the quantitative analysis above indicates, the *Metamorphoses* are in a secondary position in comparison with Vergil's works as a verbal resource for the *Punica*. Yet the Ovidian corpus still offers some essential elements to Silius's description of famine and desperation. As Spaltenstein's commentary observes, Ovid's description of personified *Fames* provides some of the motifs adapted by Silius for his starving Saguntines, such as the hard skin, visible intestines (which Silius recombines

TABLE 9.4. Spaltenstein's (1986) list of hexameter sources for Silius, *Punica* 2.461–74

<i>Silius, Punica</i> 2.461–74	Source text	Citation
<i>Major sources for the passage</i>	<i>Descriptions of famine, thirst, and plague: Ov. Met. 8.799ff., Luc. BC 4.324ff., Stat. Theb. 4.726ff., Verg. Aen. 2.356ff.</i>	
461 sedet acta medullis iamdudum atque inopes penitus coquit intima pestis. est furtim lento misere durantia tabo	dura cutis; per quam spectari viscera possent (hard skin, through which the guts could be seen)	Ov. <i>Met.</i> 8.803
viscera et exurit siccitas sanguine venas	gelant venae et siccis cruor aeger adhaeret / visceribus (the veins freeze and diseased blood sticks to the dry guts)	Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 4.734–35 ^a
465 per longum celata fames . iam <u>lumina</u> retro	collecta fatigat edendi / ex longo rabies et siccae sanguine fauces (tormented by the long-gathering fury of famine, and by his dry, bloodless jaws [tr. Fairclough 1918])	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 9.63–64
exesis <u>fugere</u> genis, iam lurida sola	hirtus erat crinis, <u>cava lumina</u> , pallor in ore (her hair was shaggy, her eyes were hollow, her face pale)	Ov. <i>Met.</i> 8.801 ^b
tecta cute et venis male iuncta trementibus ossa exstant consumptis visu deformia membris. umentis rores noctis terramque madentem	effossam sitientes lambere terram (thirsty, they dig the earth and lick it)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 3.346

470 solamen fecere mali cassoque labore e sicco frustra presserunt robore sucos.			
nil temerare piget; rabidi ieunia ventris	foedaque contingi maculato attingere morsu (touch things disgusting to encounter with our defiled lips) scelerantem sanguine fauces (defiling his jaws with blood) improba ventris / exegit caecos rabies (shameless hunger of the belly drives them blindly on)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 3.348 Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 8.761 Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 2.356–57	
insolitis adiungunt vesci, resolutaque nudos			
linquentes clipeos armorum tegmina mandunt.	plurimaque humanis ante hoc incognita mensis / diripiens (snatching many things not known to human tables before this)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 6.116–17 ^c	

NOTE: Boldface and underlining represent verbal correspondences; thematic correspondences have no markup; and nonhexameter parallels are listed in footnote b.

^a Recorded incorrectly as “Stat. *Theb.* 4.728” in Spaltenstein 1986, ad loc.

^b Spaltenstein further cites potential nonhexameter sources such as Ov. *Am.* 3.5.45: “gelido mihi sanguis ab ore / fugit” (“the blood fled from my cold mouth”); Hor. *Epod.* 17.22: “ossa pelle amicta lurida” (“bones covered in lurid skin”); *Trag. Inc.* 189 (Ribbeck 1871): “refugere oculi” (“the eyes withdrew”); and parallels such as *Mulomedicina Chironis* 146: “anus introrsus fugit” (“the anus recedes within”).

^c Spaltenstein also cites prose parallels such as Livy 23.19.13 and Val. Max. 7.6.2

TABLE 9.5. *Tesserae* scores for interpretatively meaningful matches not listed by Spaltenstein between Silius, *Punica* 2.461–74 and pre-Ovidian sources

<i>Silius, Punica</i> 2.461–74	<i>Pre-Ovidian source</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Tesserae score</i>
461 sedet acta medullis	extremis proferre medullis / cogor inops (helpless, I am forced to bring [these complaints] forth from my innermost marrow)	Catull. 64.196–97	8
iamdudum atque inopes penitus coquit intima pestis .	nec funditus omnes / corporeae excedunt pestes , penitusque necesse est (nor have all the body's plagues entirely left, and it is necessary that deep within ...)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 6.736–37	9
est furtim lento misere durantia tabo	nota nimis miseris atroque fluentia tabo (too well known to the wretched people and flowing with dark gore)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 9.472	8
viscera et exurit siccitas ^a sanguine venas	visceribus miserorum et sanguine vescitur atro (he eats the wretched people's guts and dark blood)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 3.622	9
465 per longum celata fames. iam lumina retro exesis fugere genis, iam lurida sola			
tecta cute et venis male iuncta tremantibus ossa	gelidusque per ima cucurrit / ossa tremor ^b (a cold shudder rushed through their innermost bones)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 2.120–21	9
exstant consumptis visu deformia membris .	cum videam membra ac partis consumpta regigni, (when I see members and parts [of the world] consumed and reborn)	Lucr. <i>DRN</i> 5.244	9

umentis rores noctis terramque <u>madentem</u>	quotiens umentibus umbris / nox operit terras (as often as night covers the land with its moist shadow) <u>terra</u> torique <u>madent</u> . ^c (the ground and the couches are wet)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 4.351–52	9
470 solamen fecere mali <u>cassoque</u> <u>labore</u>	solamenque mali . (consolation of evil) Ergo hominum genus in cassum frustra ^q ue laborat (therefore the human race labors to no purpose and in vain)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 9.334	10
e sicco <u>frustra</u> presserunt robore sucos.		Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 3.661	10
nil temerare piget; rabidi ieiunia ventris		Lucr. <i>DRN</i> 5.1430	8
insolitis adigunt vesci, resolutaque nudos	quae stravit Rutulos late armorumque resoluit / tegmina (which laid out the Rutulians far and wide and loosed their arms' covering)	Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 9.517–18	9
linquentes clipeos armorum tegmina mandunt.	resoluto corporis omni / tegmine (all the body's covering loosened)	Lucr. <i>DRN</i> 3.576–77	9

^a *Tesserae* does not associate the lexemes *siccatus*, *-a*, *-um* (“dried”) and *siccus*, *-a*, *-um* (“dry”), and so does not match this line with Verg. *Aen.* 8.261: “siccum sanguine guttur” (“bloodless throat”) or *Aen.* 9.64: “siccae sanguine fauces” (“bloodless jaws”).

^b *Tesserae* also matches the similar contexts Verg. *Aen.* 6.55, 12.448: “Ossa tremot.”

^c *Tesserae* also matches Verg. *Aen.* 12.691: “sanguine terra madet striduntque hastilibus aerae” (“blood wets the earth and the air shrieks with spears”).

into hardened intestines), and protruding bones (“ossa . . . exstabant”). As the discussion of “consumpta membra” immediately above indicates, some of the collocations listed here are not distinctively Ovidian. The phrase “longa fames” (“long hunger”) is part of the standard vocabulary of siege in prose writing as well as poetry. It can also refer to a long time between meals, without the connotation of desperation, or to metaphorical “hunger” for objects other than food.²³ The collocation *lumen* + *genae* is not uniquely Ovidian either: “eyes” and “cheeks” occur together in earlier poetry in a wide variety of contexts, as might be expected of words in the same conceptual domain.²⁴ What may prompt the interpreter to re-examine Ovid’s narrative of Niobe’s transformation (*Met.* 6.304–5) for the possibility of adaptation in the *Punica* passage, however, is the detailed account of physical processes. Niobe’s blood dries up, her tongue freezes, and her veins stop moving as she turns to stone; the Saguntines suffer a lesser degree of immobilization as their intestines harden and the blood dries up in their veins. For the motif of skin that barely covers bone, Silius apparently turned not to the *Metamorphoses* but to Ovid’s hyperbolic account of his desperation in exile (*Tr.* 4.6.42). Lucan then applies the triple collocation to one of the snakebite victims of Cato’s unfortunate army (see table 9.7 and discussion).

The phrase “ieiunia ventris” (“the stomach’s hunger”) is found only at *Metamorphoses* 15.95 and *Punica* 2.472. Where earlier poets had applied the noun *ieiunia* (“hunger, emptiness”) to other kinds of lack,²⁵ Ovid mainly applies it to hunger. The repetition of the unique phrase evokes the opening of the speech of Pythagoras (*Met.* 15.75–478). The phrase comes at the end of the speech’s exordium (15.75–95), in which Pythagoras urges mankind to abstain from consumption of animal flesh in the strongest possible language, as if he were accusing them of cannibalism: “parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis / corpora! . . . nec, nisi perdideris alium, placare voracis / et male morati poteris ieiunia ventris!” (“Mortal men, cease to defile your bodies with unspeakable meals . . . nor, unless you destroy another being, will you be able to satisfy the emptiness of your voracious and unhappily waiting stomach!,” *Met.* 15.75–76, 94–95). Silius’s evocation of Pythagoras’s accusation of cannibalism is an important component of his representation of the Saguntine siege. The popular tradition surrounding Hannibal’s capture of the city imputed cannibalism to the desperate Saguntines, though the best-known historiographical accounts, such as those of Livy and Polybius, do not.²⁶ Silius demonstrates his awareness of this tradition by presenting his Saguntines as

ready to eat their fellows until *Fides* restrains them (*Pun.* 2.521–25). This later passage again evokes Pythagoras's lecture in its association of cannibalism with unspeakable crime and animal behavior. These are examples of how a *Tesserae* search may supply initial indications of verbal overlap that then enable qualitative discussion of the relationship between Ovidian source and Silian target. Ovidian framing is essential to this scene's description of hunger's effect on the body and mind. This brief survey of the Saguntine famine passage's reuse of phrases from the Ovidian corpus highlights Ovid's role as the originator of some distinctive collocations, but also suggests his significance as an intermediary between Vergil's *Aeneid* and post-Augustan epic, including the *Punica*. The results derived from a *Tesserae* comparison of the *Punica* passage and post-Augustan hexameter corroborate this picture (table 9.7).

Some of these collocations originate in Lucretius or Augustan epic (*sanguin*-* + *vena*, "blood" + "vein"; *cassus labor*, "vain labor"), but their adaptation in the post-Augustan context is nevertheless significant. As mentioned above, Lucan adapted the triple collocation of "skin covering bone" (*ossa* + *cutis* + *tego*) from Ovid's *Tristia*. It is accordingly likely that the triple collocation in the *Punica* represents a window allusion. Silius's description of the Saguntines' maceration is enhanced by its evocation of both the Ovidian narrator, thinned by his exilic anxieties, and the unfortunate Catonian soldier Sabellus, victim of the deadly *seps* snake.²⁷ In their desperation, the Saguntines attempt to nourish themselves on tree sap, an expedient that works for Katniss in the arena of *The Hunger Games* but not for the doomed victims of Hannibal's siege.

The collocation *robor*-+ *sucus* ("wood" + "juice") is not attested before Statius, who applies the phrase to the burning of fragrant incense at the extravagant funeral of Opheltes. The phrases match not only through their comparatively rare vocabulary (which accounts for their high *Tesserae* score), but also through their identical location in the clausula. Yet it is impossible to assert definitively any of the following conclusions:

1. The match represents a meaningful contrast between the Saguntines' destitution and the Argives' opulence.
2. The match signifies a conscious interaction between Silius and Statius, but represents only the adaptation of a convenient clausula rather than its original narrative context.
3. There is no conscious connection whatsoever behind the match; the match is merely a chance overlap of vocabulary.

TABLE 9.6. *Tesserae* scores for interpretatively meaningful matches not listed by Spaltenstein between Silius *Punica* 2.461–74 and Ovidian sources

	<i>Ovidian source</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Tesserae score</i>
461 sedet acta medullis iamdudum atque inopes penitus coquit intima pestis. est furtim lento misere durantia tabo	lentaque miserrima tabe / liquitur (very wretched, she wastes away with slow rot) <u>dura</u> cutis, per quam spectari <u>viscera</u> possent; (hard skin, through which the guts could be seen)	<i>Met.</i> 2.807–8 <i>Met.</i> 8.803	10 7
<u>viscera</u> et exurit siccitas sanguine venas ^a			
465 per longum celata fames. iam <u>lumina</u> retro	longamque imprudens exsoluisse famem (incautiously she ended her long hunger) fecerat obsidio iam diuturna famem (the lengthy siege had already caused a famine) ne flectat <u>retro</u> sua <u>lumina</u> , (lest he turn back his gaze)	<i>Fast.</i> 4.534 <i>Fast.</i> 6.352 <i>Met.</i> 10.51 <i>Met.</i> 6.304–5 <i>Met.</i> 14.754–56	9 7 8 8 8
exesis <u>fugere</u> genis , iam lurida sola	lumina maestis / stant immota genis (her eyes stood motionless in her sad face) calidusque e corpore sanguis / inducto pallore <u>fugit</u> , conataque <u>retro</u> / ferre pedes haesit (the hot blood fled from her body, pallor set in, and she stuck as she attempted to head back)		

	et patiar fossis lumen abire genis (I would suffer my eyes to be gouged from my cheeks)	<i>Pont.</i> 2.8.66	8
tecta cute et venis male iuncta trementibus ^b ossa	vix habeo tenuem, quae tegat ossa, cutem (I hardly have thin skin to cover my bones)	<i>Tr.</i> 4.6.42	9
exstant <u>consumptis</u> visu deforma <u>membris</u> .	ossa sub incurvis exstant arida lumbis (her dry bones stood out under curving limbs)	<i>Met.</i> 8.804	9
	<u>consumptaque</u> membra senecta (limbs consumed by old age)	<i>Met.</i> 14.148	10
umentis rores noctis terramque madentem	tum superiniecta texere madentia terra (then they covered the wet [hide] by throwing earth on it)	<i>Fast.</i> 5.533	8
470 solamen fecere mali cassoque labore			
e sicco frustra presserunt robore sucos.			
nil temerare piget; rabidi ieiunia ventris	et male morati poteris ieiunia ventris? (And will you be able [to satisfy] your stomach's insatiable hunger?)	<i>Met.</i> 15.95	9
insolitis adigunt vesi, resolutaque nudos linquentes clipeos armorum tegmina mandunt.			

^aThe clause *sanguin-** + *ven-** is common in Ovid (*Met.* 2.824: “pallent amisso sanguine venae,” “the veins grow pale as the blood is lost”; see also *Met.* 5.436, 7.334), but may equally have been adapted from Vergil (see table 9.5).

^bThe collocation *ossa* + *tremor* is common in Ovid (*Met.* 10.424: “ossaque [sensit enim] penetrat tremor,” “a tremor entered her bones [for she under- stood]”; cf. *Her.* 5.38, 14.19), but may equally likely have been adapted from Vergil (see table 9.5).

TABLE 9.7. *Tesserae* scores for interpretatively meaningful matches not listed by Spaltenstein between *Punica* 2.461–74 and post-Ovidian sources

<i>Silius, Punica</i> 2.461–74	<i>Post-Ovidian source</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Tesserae score</i>
461 sedet acta medullis			
iamdudum atque inopes penitus coquit intima pestis.			
est furtim lento misere durantia tabo			
viscera et exurit siccitas <u>sanguine</u> venas	depositas et opes terrarum exurere venis (to smelt the riches deposited in the earth's veins)	Manil. <i>Astr.</i> 4.247	9
	nec <u>sanguine</u> Pollux / territus averso <u>siccabat</u> ^a vulnera caestu (unterrified by the blood, Pollux was drying his wounds with the back of his glove)	Val. Flacc. <i>Arg.</i> 4.331–32	9
	calido complentur sanguine vena (the veins are filled with hot blood)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 4.630	9
per longum celata fames. iam lumina retro			
exesis fugere genis; iam lurida sola			
tecta cute et venis male iuncta trementibus ossa	fugit rupta cutis pallentiaque ossa retexit (the ruptured skin flees and uncovers the pale bones)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 9.768	8
exstant consumptis visu deformia membra .	e mediis extantes ossibus hastas (spears sticking out from the middle of the bones)	Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 7.769	10

umentis rores noctis terramque madentem 470 solamen fecere mali cassoque labore	membrorum spatia et tantis ferus ossibus extat (the space of his limbs and ferocious he stands with huge bones)	Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 6.755	9
e sicco frustra presserunt <u>robore</u> sucos.	cedit in immensum cassus labor (vain labor proceeds into the deep) cassique labores (vain labors) curvato robore pressae (pressed down as the trees curve) nec non Assyriis pinguescunt robora sucis (and the wood grows fat with Assyrian juices)	Luc. <i>BC</i> 2.663 Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 11.80 Luc. <i>BC</i> 1.390	10 10 9
nil temerare piget; rabidi ieiunia ventris insolitis adigunt vesci, resolutaque nudos	resoluto vertice nudus (bare with his head uncovered)	Stat. <i>Theb.</i> 9.700	10
linquentes clipeos armorum tegmina mandunt.	commutant clipeos inimica proelia linquunt (they change their shields and leave the hostile battle)	Il. <i>Lat.</i> 563	8

^a See the note on *siccitas* in table 9.5 (pre-Ovidian sources)

Readers will necessarily choose different positions on this interpretative spectrum, which ranges from the greatest significance to the least. In my commentary on the passage, I occupy a position between the first and the second. The contrast between Argives and Saguntines may not have been consciously intended, but the newly coined clausula was probably memorable.

The juice pressed from the bark of an epic *liber* represents one of many examples of the new interpretative challenges posed by the abundance of meaningful data easily generated by the *Tesserae* project. Automated search discovers more instances of text reuse than human reading or human-initiated searches of the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) Latin literature database. Judicious use of *Tesserae* offers the materials for discovery rather than comprehensive interpretations, in the same way that an article in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*TLL*) may suggest paths for future research on a given passage but does not provide a reading. *Tesserae* should accordingly represent a new baseline, a tool as fundamental to philological research as *TLL*, PHI, or the standard grammars. Through its applications in quantitative as well as qualitative analysis, *Tesserae* serves both the close reader (such as the philological commentator) examining the use of a single phrase and the “distant” or macroanalytic reader (see Moretti 2005; Jockers 2013) endeavoring to discern patterns across the entire literary corpus.

NOTES

This chapter depends on the generosity of a number of people. Thanks to Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover for their kind invitation to present this unconventional approach to repetition. Neil Coffee and Chris Forstall develop and maintain *Tesserae*. Kyle Gervais and Wei Lin are my collaborators on a larger-scale study of quantitative text reuse in Latin poetry. Chris Forstall generated and verified the data sets on which the present and ongoing study is based. Each has provided invaluable feedback and encouragement on this chapter, and none should be held responsible for any errors of fact or judgment.

1. See Dominik 2010 for the change in Silius’s fortunes. Newman 1986, 232, is representative of the traditional school of criticism: “a kindly Roman amateur of letters, busy with trivialities” (quoted in Dominik 2010, 438).

2. See Coffee 2013 and the recent special issue of the *American Journal of Philology* on “Intertextuality” (2013, vol. 134, no. 1) for the current state of the art.

3. The polarities of the debate regarding intentionality are well represented by Farrell 2005 and Edmunds 2001.

4. Examples include (a) Sil. *Pun.* 2.367: “Acheronta videbo” (“I will see Acheron”) ~ Verg. *Aen.* 7.312: “Acheronta movebo” (“I will move Acheron”); (b) Sil. *Pun.* 2.109:

“crebra . . . spicula” (“close-packed missiles”) ~ Hom. *Il.* 11.576: πυκινῶσι . . . βελέεσσι (“close-packed missiles”); (c) Silius’s Hannibal as a recapitulation of earlier epic figures such as Vergil’s Turnus and Lucan’s Caesar (Marks 2010). All translations in this chapter are mine.

5. Using *Tesserae*, Coffee and his team have identified 25 percent more interpretatively significant instances of verbal reuse than the standard philological commentaries on Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* 1 (Viansino 1995; Roche 2009). They further rank the relative reuse of the twelve books of Vergil’s *Aeneid* in *Bellum Civile* 1.

6. See Forstall et al. 2014 for details of the *Tesserae* scoring system.

7. Ov. *Met.* 5.134: “singultantem animam et versantem lumina vidit” (“he saw him gasping out his life and turning his eyes”); Sil. *Pun.* 2.362: “singultantem animam; nos, nos contra ibimus hostem” (“[let him keep] his sobbing breath; we ourselves will go against the enemy”). *Tesserae* cannot currently account for word order or metrical *sedes*, though future refinements to the algorithm may be able to weight these features.

8. *Tesserae* matches lexemes, not individual morphological forms, and counts the frequency of lexemes rather than forms. The score is accordingly unaffected by the morphological differences between *ipsa* and *ipse*, or *vidi* and *videbor*.

9. See Bernstein, Gervais, and Lin (forthcoming) for further details.

10. See <http://tess-dev.caset.buffalo.edu/html/batch.php>.

11. Ennius’s works were excluded from analysis because of their brevity and textual instability. For editions of works in the *Tesserae* database, see <http://tesserae.caset.buffalo.edu/sources.php>.

12. The high residual score of the *Ilias Latina* is more likely to be the result of both texts’ intense level of reuse of Vergilian phrases rather than any particular engagement on Silius’s part with the Latin condensation of Homer. The poem was once briefly suspected of being by Silius Italicus, thanks to an acrostic that appeared to spell out the name *ITALICVS*. The acrostic, however, depends on textual emendation, and Baebius Italicus was another possible candidate for authorship. Authorship is now thought to be unknowable, based on the current state of evidence. See *New Pauly* s.v. *Ilias Latina*.

13. Verg. *G.* 3.460; Ov. *Met.* 2.824, 5.436, 7.334; Luc. *BC* 4.630; Sil. *Pun.* 2.464. Occurrences in texts not included in this study include [Verg.] *Ciris* 226; Ov. *Ars am.* 3.503.

14. I.e., *DRN-G.*, *DRN-Met.* (3 times), *DRN-BC*, *DRN-Pun.*; *G.-Met.* (3 times), *G.-BC*, *G.-Pun.*; *Met.-BC* (3 times), *Met.-Pun.*; *BC-Pun.*

15. For the Flavian epic poets, see Hardie 1989.

16. For example, *Tesserae* assigns a score of 10 to the phrase *culmin-* villae* (“rooftop,” “villa”), matched at Auson. *Mos.* 284 and Ov. *Met.* 1.295; but the phrase originates at Verg. *Ecl.* 1.82: “villarum culmina.” The program, however, also assigns the rare (and highly weighted) score of 11 to the phrase “Nepheleidos Helles” (Auson. *Mos.* 287), found in previous Latin hexameter poetry only at Ov. *Met.* 11.195. A similar

example for the pairing of the *Mosella* and the *Ilias Latina* would be the following: Auson. *Mos.* 278: “carptas moribundis piscibus herbas” (“herbs cropped by dying fish”) ~ *Il. Lat.* 371: “et carpit virides moribundus dentibus herbas” (“dying, he cropped green grass with his teeth”); but cf. Luc. *BC* 6.686: “ore novas poscens moribundus labitur herbas” (“[the horse] fell dead as it looked for new grass with its teeth”).

17. For discussion of the distinction between historical and mythological epic in the Flavian epic poets, see Galli 2013; Heerink 2013.

18. Zissos’s description of Valerius Flaccus’s allusive practices applies equally well to the *Punica* (2008, xxxvii): “Dense, multi-level allusivity is a defining and constitutive feature. . . . In contemplating virtually any passage, the reader’s awareness of the reception and reworking of a wide spectrum of earlier literature is a crucial determinant of the aesthetic effect.”

19. See Coffee et al. 2012a for an example of a subjective five-point ranking system for sorting *Tesserae* matches from “less significant” to “more significant.”

20. E.g., Ov. *Am.* 3.10.27–28: “vidit, et ut tenerae flammam rapuere medullae, / hinc pudor, ex illa parte trahebat amor” (“she gazed, and as her tender marrow caught fire, on this side shame, on the other side love drew her”); Verg. *Aen.* 4.66, 8.389; Sen. *Phaed.* 281; Luc. *BC* 5.811.

21. Dido’s love for Aeneas, for example, is described as a *pestis* (“plague”) at Verg. *Aen.* 1.711 and 4.90; see Pease 1935, ad loc., for further parallels.

22. [Sen.] *Oct.* 69 also may have adapted the phrase (“totque malorum breve solamen,” “a brief consolation for so many evils”) but is an unlikely intermediary source for Silius.

23. Siege—e.g., Caes. *B Gall.* 5.29.7: “at certe longinqua obsidione fames esset timenda” (“but certainly famine was to be feared in a long siege”). No connotation of desperation—Ov. *Fast.* 6.530. Metaphorical hunger—Q. Curt. *Alex.* 5.1.6: “ex longa fame satiaret se auro” (“after long deprivation he satiated himself with gold”).

24. The collocation occurs in earlier poetry at Catull. 68.55–56; Verg. *Aen.* 12.220–21; etc.

25. The earlier poets applied *ieiunia* to lack of children (Verg. *G.* 3.128), light ([Verg.] *Moretum* 4), and an *index* (Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.291). Only Propertius anticipates Ovid’s use, but in a mythological periphrasis (“ieiunia Phinei,” Prop. 3.5.41) rather than a straightforward designation like Ovid’s. Ovid applies the noun to hunger again at *Met.* 1.312, 4.263, 8.820, and 8.831 (personified *Fames*), 11.370, and at *Fast.* 4.607.

26. Cannibalism was part of the popular tradition of the siege (e.g., Petron. *Sat.* 141.9), and is attested for other sieges, such as the Roman assault on Numantia in 133 BC (App. *Hisp.* 96).

27. Statius’s account of Tityus’s exposure to the birds of prey in the underworld (*Theb.* 6.755) employs another triple collocation (*membra, ossa, exsto*, “limbs,” “bones,” “stand out”) found in the Silius passage, but the connection between these passages is not as meaningful.

Return to Enna

Ovid and Ovidianism in Claudian's
De raptu Proserpinae

STEPHEN HINDS

exigit ipse locus raptus ut virginis edam:
plura recognosces, pauca docendus eris.

The place itself demands that I tell the rape of the Maiden: the greater part will be familiar to you; there are a few new things to learn.

—Ovid, *Fasti* 4.417–18

It is hardly by accident that, among “mainstream” Latinists, the unfinished *De raptu Proserpinae* is the least neglected nowadays of Claudian’s long poems.¹ To a reader who is a stranger to the late fourth century, the *DRP* will have a more familiar look than does the imperial court poetry of praise or invective that otherwise dominates Claudian’s epic and quasi-epic oeuvre. This is a poem set in a timeless world of classical myth and devoid of contemporary historical reference (except in a pair of elegiac prefaces); a poem that, when not post-Vergilian (as it often is), can fairly be called post-Ovidian, both in general aesthetic and in specific adoption of a twice-told myth from the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*; and also (in the context of Alison Keith’s chapter in this volume) a poem that, if stripped of identifying marks, might plausibly be antedated three hundred years and read as an immediate successor to the Flavian epics of Statius and others.

And yet in a generation of critical work that has transformed our understanding and appreciation of first-century CE Roman epic, from the *Metamorphoses* to the *Achilleid*,² only a few attempts have been made to extend similar rethinking to Claudian and to the *DRP*. This is to repeat the opening remarks of a companion piece to this chapter (of which more in a moment); here

too, it is necessary to begin by registering the image problem that has often relegated one of the most attractive and effervescent narrative poems in the classical tradition to the margins of critical discussion.

Maurice Platnauer's verdict on Claudian in the introduction to the 1922 Loeb edition is often quoted: "Claudian's faults are easy to find. He mistook memory for inspiration and so is often wordy and tedious. . . . Worse than this he is frequently obscure and involved. . . . The besetting sin, too, of almost all post-Vergilian Roman poets, I mean a 'conceited' frigidity, is one into which he is particularly liable to fall." Now, this was written over ninety years ago. But while some of us are old enough to remember a time when this was the kind of thing that people said about Ovid (at least if "facile ingenuity" is substituted for "obscurity"), the fact is that (by and large) this is *still* the kind of thing that people say about Claudian. Even the poet's champions are at times faint-hearted in their championship, making the best of the faults that inherited wisdom imputes to the poet rather than calling them into question: "conceited" frigidity, as above; excessive addiction to ornament; and inability to sustain a coherent plot or argument, spun by defenders of Claudian (as by defenders of Ovid, Lucan, and Statius before them) into a preference for "episodic structure."³

I bring this up because in the context of a volume concerned to reclaim "repetition" as a dynamic and enabling term to apply to the poetry of Ovid, the poetry of Claudian is still more likely to be faulted, in the old way, for being (simply) "too repetitive." The aim of this chapter's main case study, therefore, will be to read the *DRP* as a poem that knows how to use repetition as a force for artistic good—not least in its responsiveness to the poetics of repetition in Ovid's (repeated) Persephone narratives of almost four centuries earlier.⁴ And because there is some risk that the inherent structure of such a chapter will confirm Claudian's secondary status by encouraging the critic to slip into familiar Ovidian ways of reading, as into a comfortable and well-worn shoe, my first move will be to gesture toward that other article of mine on the *DRP*, which was conceived in parallel to this one and appeared in 2013.

CLAUDIANISM

As a prophylactic against the titular focus here upon Ovidianism, the 2013 article is titled "Claudianism in the *De Raptu Proserpinae*," and its emphasis is less upon Claudian's inheritances from the past than upon circumstances and pressures peculiar to the poet's own end-of-fourth-century life and times.⁵

Focusing upon some of the things in Claudianic epic that majority critical opinion on the period still thinks of as overworked literary themes and topics, I ask if it is possible to look at them anew with fresh and unjaded eyes—and to do so *in Claudian's own terms*. Matters addressed include the poetics of cosmic and imperial division, gigantomachy, epithalamium, and epic's beginnings and interrupted ends. In its own way, then, it is an essay about repetition.

That article includes some words about linguistic biculturality, which will bear a brief reprise here.⁶ Born in Alexandria, Claudius Claudianus enters the history of Roman literature as a native speaker of Greek. He is, then, one of those poets (like Statius in an earlier century) with an inherent (and often overlooked) capacity to reanimate the originaive dialogue between Greek and Latin upon which Roman literature is founded. More than that, within the category of Roman poets with a claim to linguistic biculturality, Claudian is one of the very few from whom we actually have extant verse in both languages—including a pair of incomplete gigantomachies, one in Greek and one in Latin, apparently from different phases of the poet's career. This may have no practical effect upon our reading, or it may license us to press a little harder whenever we encounter in Claudian's work—not least in the *DRP*—moments of verbal interplay across languages.

In a long view of epic tradition, Claudian's general way of structuring his extended poems fits with ease and predictability into a persistent pattern of *cosmic dualism*, involving some imagistic appeal to balanced or opposing forces in the human and/or divine realms, a pattern hardwired into Roman epic tradition from Vergil on. Even without fourth-century imperial politics, this is the way we would expect Claudian to write epic: not just in his versions of political epic (some panegyric, some invective), but in the *DRP* too. So, then, to claim a sense of Claudianic renewal for these oft-repeated epic moves, in the 2013 article I emphasize *how peculiarly well* this pattern fits the *lived experience* of poet and readers at this point in history. Claudian moves within a world, personally and politically, that positions him perfectly not just to inhabit but to re-energize the age-old epic topoi of cosmic dualism—the world of a problematically divided Western and Eastern empire, a division at once cosmic, geopolitical, and fraternal, and (this is important) a division still sufficiently provisional in the generation after Theodosius that the vocabulary of division entails the vocabulary of reconciliation, and vice versa.

And when we turn from Claudian's political poetry to his mythological *DRP*, what is interesting is that we do not leave behind this world of potential-civil-war dualism: no, we keep it, but we map it along a different axis, vertical

rather than horizontal. Again two brothers divide the world between them, not West to East (Honorius and Arcadius) but Upper to Lower (Jupiter and Dis). In this version of Claudianism as in that, imperial epic is split-imperial epic.⁷

OVIDIANISM: TOWARD REPETITION

What with all this overdetermined cosmology, Claudian's version of epic is in general a weighty business.⁸ Even though the poems and their individual books are at the short end for the genre (more like so-called epyllia), this is epic with the volume control turned up. Claudian does not apologize for bringing the full rhetorical (and gigantomachic) panoply of the genre to wars divine and human, to epicized poems of celebration and denunciation; and, in some respects, the mythological *DRP* can be assimilated to this paradigm.⁹ And yet an approach to the *DRP* can work in the opposite way too, reading this as the one epic poem in which Claudian *lightens things up*, taking a holiday from his day-job as a writer of overwrought poems on the cosmic and terrestrial entailments of the imperial court. That is, notwithstanding the undifferentiated charge against all Claudianic epic of overindulgence in big speeches and in set-piece rhetoric regarded as excessive by Augustan canons of taste, there is a good case to be made for a finding that the *DRP* is actually self-consciously *uninflated* in comparison with Claudian's own rhetorical practice elsewhere (more on this below).

The temptation to read the *DRP* in this way is, of course, sharpened for a reader (like the reader of this volume) who is disposed to find the poem pervasively Ovidian in its sensibility, and (hence) assimilable to a kind of alternative history of Roman epic that takes its bearings from the *Metamorphoses* rather than the *Aeneid*. The *DRP* is a story of erotic courtship and coercion; in other words, both in its more playful and in its more disturbing moments, it is the kind of narrative that Ovid had made his own. But there is at least one important difference. Whereas in the poetics of Ovid (and of the Augustan period more broadly) the expected way to "lighten" an epic, or indeed to eroticize it, is to put it into dialogue with the "opposite" mode of elegy, in Claudian's end-of-fourth-century poetic world the epic-elegy opposition (whether negotiated à la Heinze or otherwise) is in most respects obsolete.¹⁰

To acknowledge this difference is to draw an immediate distinction between two ways of seeking Ovid in the *DRP*. A broad sense of Ovidianism will argue (intuitively and I think rightly) that the mythological sensibility of the poem is unimaginable without the prior intervention in the epic tradition

of Ovid; it might go so far as to argue that Claudian picks this theme for his major mythological narrative in conscious homage to the *spirit* of the twin Persephones of the hexameter *Metamorphoses* and the elegiac *Fasti*, virtuosos exercises in Ovidian “mixing” that find generic convergence by flaunting generic difference. However, this broad or circumstantial Ovidianism is by no means the same thing as a *literal* re-engagement with Ovidian narrative style in Ovid’s own terms; the appeal to repetition is not a straightforward one.

For one thing, as just noted, the opposition between epic and elegy is in this context defunct: the driving force of erotics in the *DRP* is, rather, epithalamium, wedding song, a form that experiences a growth spurt in late antique poetry and poetics.¹¹ For another thing, the idea that the *DRP*, uniquely among Claudian’s long poems, captures an “Ovidian” lightness in its narrative mode will not easily survive a literal application of Ovidian terms of reference. If measured scene by scene and line by line against Ovid’s twin Persephone narratives, the *DRP* will inevitably be judged (on a first impression anyway) to be an exercise in rhetorical inflation, a hyper-epicization of the story whose epicizing possibilities Ovid had so delicately delineated, twice, in the parallel poems of his middle period.

And yet this is not, in itself, to invalidate an Ovidianizing approach. Take the most basic manifestation of rhetorical inflation, the set-piece speech. In the poems that represent the norm of Claudianic epic, the forward drive of the narrative is characteristically stalled by extended set speeches (as noted in the first paragraph of this section).¹² By line 200 of *De bello Gildonico*, for instance, we have seen a 100-line petition (28–127) by the goddess Roma (for whom two lines suffice in Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* 1!), and a 62-line petition (139–200) by the goddess Africa, which (Claudian hints) would have gone on to match the immediately preceding speech of Roma had not Jupiter intervened to forestall further words (*Gild.* 201: “iret adhuc in verba dolor, ni Iuppiter”). However, these figures stand in suggestive contrast with those for the *DRP*. In the first two hundred lines of our poem, the proportion of speechifying to narrative (1:3) is almost the inverse of that in *De bello Gildonico* (4:1). The two opening speeches in *DRP* are respectively 13 lines spoken by Lachesis to Dis, and 28 lines by Dis to Mercury; and just as interesting as this relative brevity, perhaps, is the fact that each speech is marked at the end by the same distinctive formula: a rapid-connecting *vix* (*DRP* 1.67: “vix illa”; 1.117: “vix ea fatus erat”).¹³ Not for *this* epic the amplitude of the unconstrained mega-speech.¹⁴ Beside Ovid’s actual versions of Persephone, whether in *Metamorphoses* or *Fasti*, the set-up scenes of the *DRP* may still look overblown.¹⁵ Beside the rest

of Claudian, however, they are rapid, concise, and pointed—the very stuff of narrative Ovidianism.

Even in a poem whose very title announces its repetition of a key Ovidian myth, then, the turn to Ovid is as often oblique as direct, and is sometimes less a matter of literal allusion than of engagement with a more general and impalpable sense of Ovidianism. It is interesting in this connection to recall that a 1940s monograph that relied upon a mechanically verbal approach to tabulate Ovid's influence upon Claudian across both poets' entire oeuvres registered almost no correspondences at all between their treatments of Persephone—which might have been expected to constitute the study's centerpiece.¹⁶

This distinction between different kinds of engagement with Ovid may have interpretative traction in another area too: Claudian's recourse in the *DRP* to Ovidian myths *other than* that of Persephone. My companion article argues that the unfinished epic is so configured as to sustain interest in a thematic of closure and continuation, even before its final unexplained break-off at 3.448. One passage not addressed in detail there is the elegiac preface at the start of book 2, from which we learn that Claudian had *almost abandoned* the poem at the end of book 1; an interruption—apparently lasting two years or more—that gets more scholarly attention for the clues it offers to the dating of the poem than for its intriguing artistic entailments.¹⁷

In that second preface Claudian pursues a parallel between himself and Orpheus, always the Ur-poet to be sure, but more particularly, for a reader of the *Metamorphoses*, a meta-poet of myth in the Ovidian manner.¹⁸ What Claudian presents is the Orpheus of the retreat to the wilderness, who in this version remains blocked as a poet until (in a novel convergence) the arrival of Hercules spurs him to resume his song (*DRP* 2 *praef.* 1–2):¹⁹

otia sopitis ageret cum cantibus Orpheus
neclectumque diu deposuisset ebur . . .

When Orpheus was at rest, with his songs lulled to sleep, and had for a long time laid down his neglected ivory instrument . . .

The circumstantially Ovidian feel of the vignette²⁰ permits us to supply the reason for Orpheus's poetic blockage, left unstated by Claudian: the trauma of the failed expedition to rescue Eurydice.²¹ That in turn may allow us to particularize the affinity between Orpheus's blockage and Claudian's: each stands in need of deliverance from an unresolved underworld narrative (a deliverance

that in Claudian's case comes from his dedicatee, Florentinus, in the Hercules role, under whose auspices the "dance" can resume: *DRP* 2 *praef.* 49–52):²²

Thracius haec vates. Sed tu Tirynthius alter,
 Florentine, mihi: tu mea plectra moves
 antraque Musarum longo torpentia somno
 excutis et placidos ducis in orbe choros.

So sang the Thracian poet. But you, Florentinus, are a second Hercules to me: you set the plectrum of my lyre in motion and shake up the caverns of the Muses, sluggish from their long slumber, and lead their gentle bands in the circle of the dance.

And herein, despite several non-Ovidian details in the vignette, lies the deeper Ovidianism of the book 2 preface: it is *because* the Orpheus of *Metamorphoses* 10 is an intradiegetic double of the poet of the *Metamorphoses* that this new Orpheus so readily suggests himself, by way of programmatic repetition, as a figure for the stalled poet of the *DRP*.

These metapoetics of interruption are further compounded by the fact that the hiatus in the *DRP*'s composition at the end of book 1 is immediately preceded by a scene in which Claudian's Proserpina interrupts *her* composition of a *tapestry* that shows all the features of both cosmic icon and mise en abyme (*DRP* 1.266–72):²³

nec non et patruī pingit sacraria Ditis
 fatalesque sibi Manes; nec defuit omen,
 praescia nam subitis maduerunt fletibus ora.
 coeperat et vitreis summo iam margine texti
 Oceanum sinuare vadis; sed cardine verso
 cernit adesse deas imperfectumque laborem
deserit . . .

And she also depicted the sacred regions of her uncle Dis, and the spirits, her fateful lot; nor was there an omen lacking, for, as if knowing the future, her face was drenched with sudden tears. She had even now begun to curl the Ocean with its glassy waves round the very edge of the weaving; but the door-hinge turned and she saw the goddesses [Venus etc.] enter, and left her work incomplete . . .

Although the idea of a weaving Proserpina derives not from Ovid but from the Orphic traditions of the Persephone myth,²⁴ we can probably agree that Claudian would not have deployed a metapoetic tapestry in quite this way without the pre-existence of the *Metamorphoses*—but in this case the sixth book rather than the fifth. All the more so in that, when Ceres encounters her daughter's abandoned tapestry two books later, the divine workmanship ("divinus . . . labor") is in the process of being sacrilegiously "completed" by a bold spider (*DRP* 3.158: "audax sacrilego supplebat aranea textu"), not so much in direct allusion to Ovid's Arachne as in indirect evocation of Ovidian artistic ecphrasis, and of a spirit of mythological victimhood for which Ovid's Arachne stands.²⁵ Another repeat, then, but not a literal one.

OVIDIANISM: RETURN TO ENNA

The instances of "repetition" just canvassed tend to move the term in the direction of a broad construal where it can become a way of talking about any or every iteration of mythic and authorial habit that enables the operation of a literary tradition. But, of course, the case of the *DRP* and Ovid's twin Persephones invites a rather more direct and specific approach to repetition as well. It is time to embrace that specificity. For my main study, I want to focus on a key locus of convergence between Claudian's and Ovid's versions of Persephone: namely the geographical site of the rape, the flower meadow of Enna. Paradoxically, however (and this will introduce an immediate subplot), it so happens that this key point of convergence has altogether vanished from the modern text of the *DRP*. My inquiry will involve some Sicilian geography, some landscape ecphrasis, and, as a necessary preliminary to both, a moment of textual criticism. I will be concentrating on Claudian's inheritance from Ovid (and others) of a very particular instance of the generalized *locus amoenus*, the "lovely landscape" of set-piece rhetorical description.

ENNA OR ETNA?

In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Persephone is abducted from the "Nysian plain" (*Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 17), most famously identified in antiquity with a place in Caria, in Asia Minor; elsewhere, more than a dozen sites all over the Greek world lay claim to the geographical association.²⁶ In later Greek and in Roman sources, a Sicilian version prevails,²⁷ and every Latin writer (even a Latin writer by cultural adoption, like Claudian) can name the specific spot where the event happened: right in the middle of Sicily, within sight of the *umbilicus* (or "navel") of the island, Enna or Henna. The place is hardwired into the history of Latin literature: not just in Ovid, of whom more in a

moment, but as the subject of the most famous *locus amoenus* in Latin prose, in Cicero's fourth *Verrine*, and (eventually) as the antitype to the garden of Eden in a famous passage of *Paradise Lost* (4.268–75).

But what's odd is this: in any of the ranking modern editions of *De raptu Proserpinae*—J. B. Hall's virtuoso "Cambridge orange" or later Teubner, J.-L. Charlet's Budé, or Claire Gruzelier's fine Clarendon commentary—the reader will look in vain for *any reference* to "that fair field / of Enna." Instead, the abduction happens from a rather higher eminence in Sicily: not Enna, a flat-topped hill surrounded by all the traditional fixings of a *locus amoenus*, but *Etna*, a towering and flame-spewing volcano that more naturally gravitates toward the opposite tradition of the *locus horridus*. The older modern editions (under the influence of Nicolaus Heinsius) had "Enna," but the canonical site of Persephone's abduction has now been erased from Claudian's poem.²⁸ Why?

Well, the first thing to note is that Etna, as well as Enna, has always had a part to play in the Sicilian version of the rape—it is from the fires of Etna that Ceres will ignite her torches to begin her nocturnal searching for Proserpina—and it is also a fact that occasional acts of brachylogy have allowed Etna to encroach upon the traditional territory of Enna before.²⁹ But what needs to be understood (and I will return to this later) is that the *DRP* offers a pointed *contrast* between Enna and Etna, which we lose if we edit Enna out of the text.

The second thing to note is that, in Latin as in English, Enna (*Henna*) and Etna (*Aetna*), along with their derivatives, do indeed make for an easy orthographical and paleographical confusion in the tradition (I will offer a confusing representation of this below, in an ad hoc apparatus to my quotation of *DRP* 1.122). "Etna" being the more famous name, the great majority of medieval scribes tend to do exactly what we would expect and assimilate the lesser-known name to the more famous one. We find the same confusion in the manuscripts of Ovid. So in Ovid the editors tidy things up, and pick "Enna" over "Etna" whenever the mythic and geographical context requires it: why not in Claudian?³⁰

The short answer, I think, is that Claudian is taken to be a *more careless reader* of literary and mythic tradition than a learned first-century poet like Ovid. And this is one reason why I began this chapter by drawing attention to Claudian's image problem. Like Cicero or like Ovid, *we* know that the abduction should happen in Enna: *but*, the argument goes (and I exaggerate for effect), Claudian, afflicted with the enfeebled mind of a poet writing in the last decadent throes of Latin classicism, anticipates the geographical simplifications of the medieval scribes, and indeed of the medieval tradition more broadly,³¹ and allows the slippage whereby all action in Sicily gravitates toward Etna.

In order to begin to reclaim Claudian as a post-Ovidian poet of geographical and rhetorical precision, let us consider a couple of these disputed Enna-or-Etna passages (DRP 2.71–75):

viderat herboso sacrum de vertice vulgus
 Henna/Aetna parens florum curvaque in valle sedentem
 compellat Zephyrum: “pater o gratissime veris,
 qui mea lascivo regnas per prata meatu
 semper et adsiduis inroras flatibus annum . . .”

Enna/Etna, mother of flowers, had seen the sacred throng from her grassy summit and addressed Zephyrus, who was sitting in the curve of the valley: “O most gracious father of the springtime, you who ever hold sway through my meadows on your playful course, and bedew the year with ceaseless breaths . . .”

The landscape from which Proserpina is stolen is such an iconic part of the myth that in Claudian it is almost one of the main characters. Indeed, as the poet sets the scene for the abduction, he gives it a voice: this speaking *locus amoenus* gives a pep-talk to the West Wind, Zephyrus, urging him to put in some extra effort in order to make her pleasance as pleasant as possible (DRP 2.73–87). What, then, is the name of this speaking landscape? “Aetna parens florum,” as in all current texts, or “Henna parens florum”?

And the answer is . . . *Henna*, of course: that is where all the flowers are to be found in the mainstream Latin tradition of the myth (Ovid, preceded by Cicero). Only through the undervaluing of Ovid as a source could *Aetna* ever have had traction. Just below, something close to allusive proof emerges when Claudian offers a near-citation of the corresponding landscape description in the *Metamorphoses*:³²

haud procul inde lacus (*Pergum* dixere Sicani)
 panditur . . . (DRP 2.112–13)

Not far from there extends a lake (the Sicani have called it Pergus)

haud procul Hennaeis lacus est a moenibus altae,
 nomine *Pergus*, aquae . . . (Ovid, *Met.* 5.385–86)

Not far from Enna's walls is a lake, Pergus by name, of deep water

The emphases tell the story. “Not far from there” is a lake named Pergus, *haud procul inde lacus*. Not far from *where*? From Etna? No, of course, from Enna, as in the passage’s Ovidian model . . . which is also, by the way, the right answer in terms of Sicilian geographical reality:

Enna to Lago di Pergusa: 7 km

Etna to Lago di Pergusa: 70 km

Another intertextual moment in the passage points in the same direction (*DRP* 2.101–3):

forma *loci* superat flores: curvata tumore
parvo *planities* et mollibus *edita* clivis
creverat in collem . . .

The beauty of the location surpassed the flowers; the plain, rounded in a slight swell and raised with gentle slopes, grew into a hill . . .

Henna autem . . . est *loco* perexcelso atque *edito*, quo in summo est aequata
agri *planities* . . . (Cicero, *Verr.* 4.107)

Now Enna . . . is in a very lofty and raised location, topped by a leveled area of plain . . .

Again, does the Roman tradition of the abduction of Persephone allow us to name the Sicilian locus characterized by a raised plain, an elevated *planities*? Yes indeed, and this time the answer is suggested by Claudian’s close verbal tracking not of Ovid but of Cicero: and again the answer is Enna, not Etna.³³

If the implicatedness of the *DRP* in Latin literary tradition strongly points to Enna rather than Etna in these cases, that answer may be independently confirmed by a somewhat contrived pun on the occasion of the very first mention of Enna (or Etna) in the *DRP*. Here, along with the promised rough guide to the orthographical tradition, is the passage in question (*DRP* 1.122–26):

Hennaeae/Aetnaeae Cereri proles optata virebat
unica nec tribuit subolem Lucina secundam
fessaque post primos haeserunt viscera partus;
infecunda quidem, sed cunctis altior extat
matribus et numeri damnum Proserpina pensat.

Hennaeae [(h)en(n)(a)e(a)e] Heinsius, Koch, and Platnauer (with C₁ O₁ O₂ δ in Hall's 1985 sigla)

Aetnaeae [(a)et(h)n(a)e(a)e] Hall, Charlet, and Gruzelier (with the great majority of the manuscripts)

Ceres of Enna/Etna had a single child, long-wanted and fresh in youth. Lucina granted her no second offspring and her womb, exhausted after the first birth, seized up; unfruitful she might be indeed, but she stood higher than all mothers, and Proserpina outweighed the loss of numbers.

In the opening line, is Ceres given an epithet from Etna (*Aetnaea*) or from Enna (*Hennaea*)? On this occasion, it can be argued, cult combines with literature to strengthen the case for Enna (Cic. *Verr.* 4.108): “nec solum Siculi, verum etiam ceterae gentes nationesque Hennensem Cererem maxime colunt” (“nor is it the Sicilians only, but the world's other races and peoples too, that have an especial reverence for Ceres of Enna”).³⁴ And even if we countenance (as I do not) the likely rejoinder that Claudian is a slapdash reader of both literature and cult, one thing that cannot be taken away from this Alexandrian-born poet is his bilingualism. So then, to a Greek speaker with a taste for a mildly macaronic pun, what does the Latin epithet *Hen-naea* suggest? Yes, “oneness.”³⁵

Hence my pattern of underlinings in the passage as quoted. On Claudian's paronomasial hint, *Henna*'s goddess Ceres is “number one.” The pun in *Hennaeae* is activated and glossed by *unica* directly below it, and by a lingering numerological hangover in the phrasing of the rest of the sentence: we are introduced to the “unique” daughter of Ceres “goddess of εἷς” (who had no “second” offspring after her “first” birth); as long as she has Proserpina, Ceres finds “balance” in her “numerical loss.” A bad pun, to be sure, but it underscores the case for reading “Enna” over “Etna” in this first glimpse of the *DRP*'s Sicilian poetics of place. And maybe not *such* a bad pun: to an open-minded reader there are no bad puns, only puns waiting to be redeemed. The odd thing is that Claudian will have his eye on the numerology of *Henna* later too. An especially interesting *ingeminat* awaits at *DRP* 3.220–22—but now it is time to pick some flowers.

ANTHOLOGY

Every writer who recounts the rape of Persephone takes up the rhetorical challenge to offer a tour-de-force description of the flowery meadow in which

the abduction takes place: the locus of the rape yields this locus of repetition. For a latecomer to the tradition like Claudian, how can the bouquet of flowers gathered by the victim and her friends do anything but proliferate, whether in length or in ornamental detail (*DRP* 2.92–100, 128–36)? But some specific items stand out. As the main group of goddesses and nymphs advances into the field, the two first-plucked blooms recapitulate, with a small shift, *Ovid's* abbreviated two-flower catalogue in *Metamorphoses* 5:³⁶

pratorum spoliatur honos; haec lilia fuscis
intexit violis . . . (*DRP* 2.128–29)

The glory of the meadows was despoiled: this nymph wove lilies together with dusky violets . . .

quo dum Proserpina luco
ludit et aut violas aut candida lilia carpit . . . (*Ov. Met.* 5.391–92)

While Proserpina was playing in this grove and plucking either violets or white lilies . . .

And, lest all Claudian's flowers be "gathered" from Latin meadows alone, the final two blooms in the *DRP* catalogue repeat the final two blooms of the Greek Ur-catalogue at the start of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the hyacinth and the narcissus—with the "translation" flagged by a parallel use of enjambment (*DRP* 2.131–36):³⁷

te quoque, flebilibus maerens Hyacinthe figuris,
Narcissumque metunt, nunc incluta germina veris,
praestantes olim pueros: tu natus Amyclis,
hunc Helicon genuit; te disci perculit error,
hunc fontis decepit amor; te fronte retusa
Delius, hunc fracta Cephisos harundine luget.

You also they harvested, Hyacinthus, mourning with your letters of lamentation, and Narcissus—now famous buds of spring, once pre-eminent boys: you were born at Amyclae, him Helicon begot; you the errant discus struck, him love of the pool beguiled; for you mourns the god of Delos with beaten brow, for him Cephisos with broken reeds.

... ἤδ' ὑάκινθον

νάρκισσόν θ', ὃν φῦσε δόλον καλυκώπιδι κούρη

Γαῖα Διδὸς βουλήσι χαριζομένη πολυδέκτη ... (*Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 7–9)

... and the hyacinth and the narcissus, which Earth grew as a snare for the flower-faced maiden, at the will of Zeus and to gratify the Host-to-Many ...

Now, while a hyacinth is also found among the flowers gathered by the Persephone of *Fasti* 4, the narcissus occurs in neither Ovidian list, being associated rather with the myth's Attic and non-Sicilian traditions, in which it has some importance.³⁸ In one sense, then, we can here see Claudian reaching with his catalogue-closing blooms across a full millennium of literature, and back from his adopted language to the language of his birth, to reconnect in the *Homeric Hymn* with the earliest origins of the story he tells anew. In another sense, however (and despite its absence from the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* catalogues), the narcissus is by now, irrevocably, *Ovid's flower* ... and *Ovid's myth*.

This is a good place to resume that earlier formulation about the role of circumstantial Ovidianism in the *DRP*, which encourages us to look for correspondences with Ovid well beyond the specifics of the twin Persephone narratives. Here, as elsewhere, Claudian's poem sees the world *at large* in a post-Ovidian way. And his landscapes, even where they are not picking up details from *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4, are post-Ovidian landscapes—in their aesthetic configuration, in their immanent potential for violence, in their points of metamorphic access to myths that have now become, as they will be for the next thousand years and more, Ovid's myths.

That is to say, although the narcissus is not in the catalogue of Persephone's flowers in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* or *Fasti*, it does *very Ovidian work* in the Claudianic passage. When Claudian “animates” the story of the boy behind the narcissus, and the boy behind the hyacinth too (*DRP* 2.133–36), he unlocks the whole image-repertoire of Ovidian mythic landscape. And it is hardly by accident that, outside the main catalogue, the bloom plucked a little earlier in Claudian's text by Venus, the instigator of the flower-gathering expedition, is the anemone, “the sign of her own grief,” as Claudian puts it (*DRP* 2.122–23): that is, the bloom formed from the blood of the dead Adonis. Narcissus, Hyacinthus, Adonis: three old myths (at least one of them very old). But *even* for a poet born in the Greek East, these myths by now spell *Metamorphoses* 3,

So we are back to the numerology of *Hen-na*, doubling the place of oneness. And here is the thing. In the Persephone tradition, there is *always* more than one Enna. This is a locus that is *always* being measured against other rhetorical and geographical versions of itself, against other *loci* and *loca*: Claudian's Enna versus Ovid's; Claudian's or Ovid's versus Cicero's; in Ovid, the *Metamorphoses* version against the parallel version in the *Fasti*. More exotically, the poetic tradition never ceases implicitly or explicitly to pit this western location for the abduction against older eastern locations, from the valley of the Cayster in Asia Minor to Eleusis in Greece (Ov. *Met.* 5.385–87):⁴²

haud procul Hennaëis lacus est a moenibus altae,
nomine Pergus, aquae; non illo plura Caystros
carmina cycnorum labentibus edit in undis.

Not far from Enna's walls there is a lake of deep water, Pergus by name; no more productive in swan-song are the gliding streams of the Cayster.

... θεὰ δ' ἐπεμαίνετο χῶρῳ
ὅσον Ἐλευσῖνι, Τριόπῃ θ' ὅσον ὀκκόσον Ἐννα. (Callim. *Hymn* 6.29–30)

And the goddess was as madly fond of the [grove of Dotium] as of Eleusis, as fond of Triopas as she was of Enna.

In a sense, then, Dis's assertion of a competing underworld rival to Enna falls into a habit of comparison already programmed into the Persephone myth's poetics of place. And this is where I would like to call to mind those celebrated lines of Milton in book 4 of *Paradise Lost* (4.268–72, 274–75):

... Not that fair field
Of Enna, where Proserpin gathering flowers
Herself a fairer flower by gloomy Dis
Was gathered, which cost Ceres all that pain
To seek her through the world ...
... might with this Paradise
Of Eden strive.

In Milton, as in Claudian, a better version of Enna is to be found, and again (as in Claudian) it is to be found in a better world: not this time in Hell, but in an earthly heaven.⁴³

ENNA VERSUS ETNA

It is time to offer some partial reinstatement to Enna's displaced "opposite." The *DRP* does offer a hellish dystopia, a *locus horridus*,⁴⁴ to contrast with the *locus amoenus* of Persephone's Sicilian meadow: *not* in the newly attractive underworld, as we have just seen, but here in Sicily itself: Mount Etna. Although I am concerned to resist the global edit that *replaces* Enna with Etna throughout the text of the *DRP*, the *opposition* between Enna and Etna is indeed an important one. Both locations have always been in play in the Sicilian version of the myth; and in the *DRP* Etna is the site around which many of the poem's most weighty epic effects cluster (notably in 1.153–78, a display piece of gigantomachic and natural philosophical description). What I want to focus on for the purposes of the present discussion is an action in the latter half of the unfinished *DRP* 3, at the point where Ceres has just declared her resolve to search for her lost daughter (*DRP* 3.330–31): "haec fatur notaeque iugis inlabitur Aetnae / noctivago taedas informatura labori" ("so she said and glided down to the ridges of familiar Etna to fashion torches to aid her night-roaming labors").

The scene is set in a nightmarish grove of trees, staged by Claudian as the most literal of his poem's many evocations of the Gigantomachy (*DRP* 3.332, 334–37):⁴⁵

lucus erat . . .
 densus et innexis Aetnaea cacumina ramis
 qua licet usque tegens. illic posuisse cruentam
 aegida captivamque pater post proelia praedam
 advexisse datur . . .

There was a grove . . . which was dense and covered the peaks of Etna, as far as it could, with interwoven branches. It is there that father Jupiter is said to have laid down his bloody aegis and brought his captured booty after the battles . . .

"Lucus erat . . .": Claudian introduces the scene with a post-Ovidian variation on the framing *est locus* formula for a set-piece landscape ecphrasis.⁴⁶ Like the *locus* or *lacus* of Enna, the *lucus* of Etna awaits the inroad of a goddess. Like the catalogue of flowers in *DRP* 2, the catalogue of trees in *DRP* 3 shows a rich diversity of species; here too, that diversity comes with a mythological

prosopography. But in this dystopic landscape the trees acquire that prosopography not through metamorphic embodiment (contrast Adonis, Hyacinthus, and Narcissus in the earlier catalogue) but through the presence of *actual decaying body parts* of mythological giants fastened to them as trophies: a macabre “fruit,” not just post-Ovidian but post-Lucanian grotesque (*DRP* 3.337–47, 353):⁴⁷

Phlegraeis silva superbit
 exuviis totumque nemus victoria vestit.
 hic patuli rictus, hic prodigiosa Gigantum
 tergora dependent, et adhuc crudele minantur
 affixae truncis facies, immaniaque ossa
 serpentum passim cumulis exangibus albent,
 et rigidae multo suspirant fulmine pelles;
 nullaque non magni iactat se nominis arbor:
 haec centumgemini strictos Aegaeonis enses
 curvata vix fronde levat; viventibus illa
 exultat Coei spoliis . . .
 inde timor numenque loco . . .

The forest glories in the spoils of Phlegra, and victory clothes its every tree. Here hang the gaping jaws, here the monstrous hides of the Giants; faces nailed to tree-trunks still threaten cruelly, the enormous bones of serpents bleach everywhere in bloodless heaps; stiff skins smoke from many a thunderbolt; there is no tree which does not boast of some great name. This one supports with difficulty on its bending foliage the drawn swords of hundred-handed Aegaeon; that one exults in the murky trophies of Coeus. . . . Thence is the fear and awe of the place . . .

As Proserpina had entered the variegated meadow of Enna to pluck flowers, so Ceres now invades the variegated grove of Etna to harvest a pair of cypresses:⁴⁸ in this elaborate account of the goddess’s acquisition of her giant torches, the mother’s action repeats the daughter’s, but with grotesque magnification.

Here, then, is one context of repetition in which to read Ceres’s acquisition of her oversized “bouquet” in *DRP* 3. But the myth’s broader literary tradition yields an even more pointed context of iteration and change for this act of tree violation (*DRP* 3.357–59):

non tamen hoc tardata Ceres, accenditur ultro
religione loci *vibrat*que infesta securim,
ipsum etiam feritura Iovem . . .

Yet Ceres was not hindered by this; she was actually fired by the sanctity of the spot and brandished her axe aggressively, even ready to strike Jupiter himself . . .

non tamen idcirco ferrum Triopeius illa
abstinuit . . .
edidit haec rapta sceleratus verba securi:
“non dilecta deae solum, sed et ipsa licebit
sit dea, iam tanget frondente cacumine terram.”
dixit et obliquos dum telum *librat* in ictus . . . (Ov. *Met.* 8.751–52, 754–57)

Yet not on account of this [holiness] did Triopas’s son [Erysichthon] keep his blade away from the tree. . . . The accursed man seized the axe and uttered these words: “Though this be not only the tree that the goddess loves, but even the goddess [Ceres] herself, it shall now touch the ground with its leafy top.” He spoke, and while he poised his weapon for the slanting stroke . . .

“χάζευ,” ἔφα, “μή τοι πέλεκυν μέγαν ἐν χροῖ πάξω.” (Callim. *Hymn* 6.53)

“Stand back,” said [Erysichthon to the disguised Demeter], “lest I fix my great axe in your flesh.”

Claudian has represented this stand of trees on Etna as a shrine consecrated to Jupiter’s victory in the Gigantomachy. When Ceres embraces the idea of sacrilege, picks up an axe, and aims it at a tree, and (moreover) declares her willingness to aim it even at the god himself, a post-Ovidian reading will recognize this as a moment of intertextual repetition and reversal—and twice over, too.⁴⁹ In terms of compendious Ovidianism, the Ceres of *Metamorphoses* 5 has turned the tables and “become” the Erysichthon of *Metamorphoses* 8 . . . who chopped down a tree sacred to Ceres, while threatening bodily harm to the goddess herself.⁵⁰ But equally (and all the more so with an eye on Claudian’s own Greek and Alexandrian origins), we should remember Ovid’s source for his Erysichthon, Callimachus’s *Hymn to Demeter*, in which the (same) story of the miscreant’s attack upon Demeter’s sacred grove

is narrated by way of *self-conscious avoidance of the story of Persephone*, thus forestalling a Callimachean “repeat” of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.⁵¹ Claudian’s goddess now in effect feeds Callimachus’s narrative back into the Homeric one, and (as well as fusing two *Ovidian* myths about Ceres) reconciles two canonical *Greek* approaches to the composition of a *Hymn to Demeter*, one Homeric and one Hellenistic.

“OMNIA IAM VULGATA” (VERG. G. 3.4)

Can there be anything more to say about *ecphrasis loci* in the *DRP*? Let us retrace our steps to Enna one more time. The first half of the third, unfinished book yields a pair of self-reflexive gestures (post-Ovidian and perhaps also post-Flavian in their affect) wherein the very tradition of praise for the flowery meadow can now be felt to *invade the plot*. What we see in both these passages, of which I here quote the first, is a marked case of literary belatedness (*DRP* 3.118–21):

timeo ne fama latebras
prodiderit leviusque meum Trinacria celet
depositum. terret nimum vulgata locorum
nobilitas.

I am fearful in case rumor has revealed [my daughter’s] hiding place and Trinacria too carelessly conceals my trust. The fame of the place, too widely publicized, terrifies me.

At this point it is impossible for a reader to experience the geography of Persephone’s abduction without experiencing *the rhetorical tradition that constitutes* the geography of Persephone’s abduction: for Claudian, the Maiden’s meadow is an *ecphrastic* meadow, experienced not just as an evocation of nature but as an evocation of virtuoso rhetorical description. And this seems to be the experience of Claudian’s characters too. In the passage above, Ceres (traveling abroad) has just had a nightmare vision that hints that all is not well back in the rosy vales of Enna.⁵² When she wakes up, she tells her host (Cybele) that she needs to return to check up on her daughter: the Sicilian location in which she had left Proserpina does not seem so safe anymore. Why not? Because it is too well known; its *nobilitas* is *nimum vulgata*. Why is it too well known? Well, Claudian’s allusion to the famous poetological catchphrase in the heading above—from Vergil’s *Georgics* 3.4, “omnia iam vulgata”

(“everything [besides] has already been published”)—tips his hand. It is too well known because it is a *locus classicus* of ecphrastic landscape description, made famous by the virtuosity of Cicero and Ovid; you cannot hope to hide your daughter in one of the most celebrated *loca amoena* in Latin literature. And why is this scenario “terrifying”? In part, because Ceres (like Claudian and his readers) has “read” the *Metamorphoses*: bad things always happen to young virgins in beautiful landscapes.⁵³

More in this vein of late antique postmodernism follows a hundred lines later, in the middle of the extended speech in which the nurse Electra gives Ceres the grim news of her daughter’s misadventure (*DRP* 3.220–27):

“ . . . prima Venus campos Hennaetaeque rura maligno
ingerit adfatu. vicinos callida flores
ingeminat meritumque loci velut inscia quaerit
nec credit quod bruma rosas innoxia servet,
quod gelidi rubeant alieno germine menses
verna nec iratum timeant virgulta Booten.
dum loca miratur, studio dum flagrat eundi,
persuadet; teneris heu lubrica moribus aetas! . . . ”

“ . . . Venus first with evil speech pressed on her the fields and countryside of Enna. She slyly redoubled her mention of the nearby flowers, and asked about the merits of the locale as if ignorant, refusing to believe that the winter solstice preserves the roses without harm, that the chill months blush with buds of other seasons, and that the spring shrubs do not fear the anger of Bootes. While she marveled over the place, while she burned with eagerness to go there, she persuaded [Proserpina]; alas, how readily does youth go astray with its tender disposition! . . . ”

For Claudian, Venus is the fixer to whom Jupiter gives the job of luring Proserpina into the meadow to set her up for abduction;⁵⁴ and in this passage we see that she does it by *praising the place*, by engaging in what the Romans call *laudes loci*: once again, just as in the earlier book 3 passage, the meadow itself has become inseparable from the rhetorical tradition of the meadow. In this new twist to the metaecphrastic plot, Venus disingenuously affects to be that unimaginable someone who at this point in literary history is *unaware of* Enna’s fame as a *locus amoenus* and as a site of *perpetuum ver* (*Ov. Met.* 5.391): therefore she quizzes Proserpina about the merits of the location, and thus in

effect makes her interlocutor complicit in *rhetoricizing the scene* of her own imminent abduction.⁵⁵

In this metaliterary context the verb *ingeminat* (DRP 3.222) is worth a second look. Venus “redoubles” her mention of the nearby flowers, praising them again and again. But for us as readers too, this is quite literally a “redoubling” of the description of the flower meadow because the DRP 3 scene is a kind of “messenger’s speech” that repeats and retells for the benefit of the late-arriving Ceres the flower-plucking scene that *we* have already read in “real time” back in DRP 2.

Venus’s *ingeminat* can make us think about *intertextual* repetition and retelling too. Metaliterarily, Venus is “redoubling” the descriptions of Enna’s flowers in Claudian’s literary predecessors, especially Ovid and Cicero; for his part, Ovid had already “redoubled” the flowers in his own work by presenting *two* Ennas, in *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4; and all these Latin versions of Enna had already “redoubled” an original Greek catalogue of flowers in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which was itself already doubled because in the *Homeric Hymn*, just as in Claudian, the flower-plucking scene is told *twice*.⁵⁶

And, finally, we are back again to the mathematics of *Hen-na*: as before, Claudian has been unable to name the place without playing on its purported etymological “oneness.” Venus “first” (*prima*) asks Persephone about the “Hen-naea . . . rura,” and then “redoubles” her request (*ingeminat*): *Henna* multiplied by two, and then multiplied by two again, until there are too many *Hennas*—unless, of course, *Aetnaea* is read in line 220, in which case we need never think of Sicilian numerology again.⁵⁷

Anyway, on any reading Ceres is right to be afraid. In terms of the bad ending programmed for Persephone, the narrative is burdened by too much praise of too many flowers plucked in too many worlds: “nimium vulgata . . .” indeed. This is what it is to experience a myth that for Claudian is already haunted by more than a millennium of cultural memory. Like Ceres, we end the unfinished poem on the track of Persephone . . . *but which track, and which Persephone?*

ENVOI 1

As I have hinted above (and argued more fully elsewhere), it can be productive to think of the author of the *De raptu Proserpinae* as himself a negotiator between divided worlds: Greek and Latin, Eastern and Western. More impalpably, this poet and his mythological poem, contemporary with (say) Prudentius, stand between another pair of worlds too: the pagan and the Christian.

In Claudian's own time, and in the generations following his death, *what was it like* for a Christian reader to read the *DRP*? Catherine Ware (2011) has posed that question—and her interesting answer is that such a reader *might just* find a way to read the *De raptu Proserpinae* as a Christian martyr-narrative. More than a millennium before Milton's Eve, the question of how to achieve a specifically Christian repetition and transformation of Ovid's Persephone is already coming onto the agenda—for Claudian's first readers if not for Claudian himself.

ENVOI 2

Tracing the ruts of Dis's chariot wheels, Ceres makes her way across Sicily from the mid-island location of the rape (*DRP* 3.438; cf. *Ov. Fast.* 4.461–62). This marks the start of a worldwide search that, had it been realized, would have yielded a travelogue rich in Ovidian and Ovidianizing patterns of repetition.⁵⁸ As Ceres crosses the coastline, the light from her torches strikes both the Italian and the Libyan shores, and then, in the last sentence before the final interruption of the *DRP*, it reaches into the cave of Scylla (3.447–48): “antra procul Scyllaeae petit, canibusque reductis / pars stupefacta silet, pars nondum exterrita latrat” (“the torchlight reaches the cave of Scylla some way off: she draws back her dogs, some of which are silent with amazement, while others bark, not yet terrified”). The epic breaks off here. I have already written something about the random yet not-quite-random feel of this moment:⁵⁹ here is an Ovidianizing angle.

Because of the well-known and often advertised confusion or conflation of two different mythological bearers of the name (the dog-girt sea monster and the daughter of Nisus), references to Scylla evolve into something of a *locus classicus* of staged or self-conscious breakdown for Latin poets, a recurrent trouble spot—especially, as it happens, for Ovid.⁶⁰ More than that, one such Scylla-cruX occurs right at the point in *Fasti* 4 where that poem's Ceres leaves Sicily to begin the global phase of her search (4.499–500): “effugit et Syrtes et te, Zancleae Charybdi, / et vos, Nisei, naufraga monstra, canes” (“she shunned the Syrtes, and you, Zanclean Charybdis, and you, Nisean dogs, monsters that cause shipwreck”). In the *Fasti* Scylla is a marine hazard avoided, in a story that still has more than half its length to run. Claudian's Scylla, however, marks the abrupt end of the *DRP*—whether the epic is left incomplete by its author's illness, death, or diversion to some other enterprise. This time around, there will be no repeat of Ovid's classic mythological howler (*Fast.* 4.500: “Nisei . . . canes”);⁶¹ instead, a different kind of poetic “shipwreck,” which on this occasion turns out to be final.

NOTES

This chapter publishes the second half of a research project on Claudian's *DRP* that was first sketched in a May 2011 conference paper at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, and then worked up as a 2012 Housman lecture at University College London: that lecture was printed as a limited-circulation UCL pamphlet, sans scholarly apparatus. The first half of the project has already been published as "Claudianism in the *De Raptu Proserpinae*" (Hinds 2013). This latest phase of work received its impetus, and its shape, from the invitation to participate in the Langford conference at Florida State University in February 2013: it is a pleasure to record my thanks to organizers and fellow participants both in Tallahassee and (in a final, 2014 tryout) at the University of Campinas, Brazil. Here in Seattle I am once again indebted to the generosity of the Lockwood Foundation for research support.

1. Translations of Claudian are mostly after Gruzelier 1993 and Platnauer 1922; except as noted, quotations of the Latin generally follow Hall 1969 and 1985. Translations of Ovid and Cicero are mine.

2. I mention the *Achilleid* not just for chronological reasons but because that poem is in its own right a key influence upon the *DRP*: so, e.g., Dilke 1954, 18–19; Gruzelier 1993, xxvii.

3. Cf. Hinds 2013, 170–71, with bibliography, including quotation of the delicious first sentence of the assessment at Platnauer 1922, 1: xvii–xviii: "Even as a poet Claudian is not always despicable."

4. Full disclosure demands that I mark this chapter as a "return" to my own earliest work on the twin Persephones of *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4 (Hinds 1987); I will try to resist the temptation to make the tropes of repetition coyly self-referential. The Ovidian programmatics in my epigraph, *Fast.* 4.417–18, are unpacked at Hinds 1987, 39–40, 71; cf. Fantham 1998, ad loc.

5. The datable points in Claudian's Latin oeuvre range between 395 (his *Panegyric on Probinus and Olybrius*; cf. *Carm. Min.* 41.13–14) and ca. 404, when his poetic tracking of the career of Stilicho appears to cease. The dating of the *DRP* within this timeframe is disputed: see further n. 17 below.

6. Hinds 2013, 172–74, with further details and bibliography.

7. The last two paragraphs excerpt and summarize a longer discussion (again with bibliography) at Hinds 2013, 174–82. Since that article went to press, all these matters have been placed on a firmer footing by the fine and wide-ranging treatment of Ware 2012, 69–80 (especially 70–71 on *DRP*) and 128–34 (especially 130 on *DRP*).

8. This section begins with some repetition of Hinds 2013, 182–83 ("Claudianism: (curbs on) rhetorical inflation") but goes on to develop the Ovidian trajectory disavowed in those pages.

9. The almost three books of the unfinished *DRP* weigh in at just under 1,200 lines, about the same length as *In Eutropium* and *De consulatu Stilichonis*; if completed it would have been Claudian's longest poem.

10. For the dynamic interplay of epic and elegiac poetics in the Augustan period, see Hinds 2000, especially 221–36; on the *Metamorphoses* specifically, cf. Knox 1986b; Hinds 1987. For the erosion of the force of elegy by Claudian's time, see Tsai 2007, 37–38.

11. For more on this, see Hinds 2013, 183–86, drawing heavily on Tsai 2007; on late antique epithalamium more broadly, see Horstmann 2004.

12. Excellent remarks at Cameron 1970, 266–73, especially 266–69. Picking up earlier comparative statistics for direct speech in epic authors, Cameron usefully distinguishes between the overall figures for use of direct speech and the figures for the length of individual speeches (the latter being the more telling statistic for Claudian). However, his discussion is not concerned with distinctions *within* Claudian's oeuvre.

13. A favorite Vergilian transition formula (Tarrant 2012 on *Aen.* 12.154, 650), common also in Ovid. With Hall 1969 I accept Barth's punctuation and emendation of *DRP* 1.67 (“vix illa; pepercit” for “vix ille pepercit”).

14. The exception that proves the rule, perhaps, is the extended speech of the nurse Electra to Ceres (on which more later), with its full reprise of the details of the abduction: *DRP* 3.196–259 (64 lines). Is it significant that this uncurtailed speech ends with Electra's lament that she is now destined to “drag out” (259: *tractura*) a lonely old age?

15. As they do, e.g., to Richardson 1974, 72.

16. Eaton 1943, 107–18, registering in the *DRP* just two correspondences apiece with the *Met.* 5 and *Fast.* 4 versions. Admittedly, her underreporting is egregious: her survey is affected by the nineteenth-century chimera of a single lost Greek *Vorbild* of which the *DRP* is (merely) a Latin copy (good remarks on this at Hall 1969, 106–8).

17. See, variously, Cameron 1970, 452–66, especially 463–64; Hall 1969, 93–105, especially 104–5; Gruzelier 1993, xvii–xx.

18. See the very suggestive remarks of von Albrecht 1989, 388.

19. Extended treatment in Felgentreu 1999, 169–81; on this new take on an old convergence between Orpheus and Hercules, see Charlet 1991, 130. On larger ramifications of the Orpheus theme elsewhere in the *DRP*, see Schmitz 2004; Bureau 2009, 55–63, especially 58–60. Harrison (forthcoming) will place the metapoetics of the *DRP* 1 and 2 prefaces on a newly firm footing.

20. And simultaneously Vergilian, of course (*G.* 4.454–527), as so often in the *DRP*. The actual incorporation of Orpheus's song-within-the-song (*DRP* 2 *praef.* 29–48) tilts the balance of reference toward the Ovidian version, as does the mini-catalogue of moving trees at *DRP* 2 *praef.* 21–24, after *Met.* 10.90–108, which ends with a markedly Ovidianized *laurus* (Daphne: the Ur-myth of sexual predation in the world of the *Metamorphoses*). Also, Tim Stover suggests to me an evocation in the song-concluding “Thracius haec vates” (*DRP* 2 *praef.* 49, quoted below) of the song-concluding “carmine dum tali . . . / Threicius vates” at *Met.* 11.1–2 (right before the ultimate “interruption” of Ovid's Orpheus by the Maenads).

21. Hence, in part, the aptness of Hercules, a hero who has successfully traveled to Hades and back, to resolve this case of Orphic torpor/aporia.

22. An old and now-discarded theory held that the book 2 preface was wrongly assigned to the *DRP* and had been written by Claudian to head up a lost poem in praise of Florentinus. To the existing arguments against this (Cameron 1970, 456–57) may be added the deft touch of metapoetic continuity that has Claudian's facilitator leading these gentle bands in the dance (2 *praef.* 52: "placidos . . . choros") immediately before Claudian's resumed epic leads Proserpina and her iconic *chorus* into their key scene in *DRP* 2. The word *chorus* is used of Proserpina's entourage of Naiads at 2.149, and also at 239, "aequalemque chorum," where it evokes *Ov. Fast.* 4.451, "chorus aequalis" (not listed in Eaton 1943).

23. Proserpina's tapestry (*DRP* 1.246–75): von Albrecht 1989, especially 383–86; Guipponi-Gineste 2010, 22–41.

24. Gruzelier 1993 on *DRP* 1.246ff.; Richardson 1974, 83–84.

25. Cf., very finely, Rosati 2004, 221–24. The sense in the latter passage that Ceres is (re)encountering the tapestry after a very long period of decay (*DRP* 3.155: "semirutas . . . telas," "half-ruined warp"; 157: "perit . . . labor," "work gone to waste") is, in realistic terms at least, at odds with the few days of mythological time that can be felt to have elapsed between Proserpina's abandonment of her loom and Ceres's arrival at the scene of the crime (cf. *DRP* 3.69–70). Is this a triumph of rhetoric over verism, or is it an arch metapoetic allusion to that gap in *compositional time* between book 1 and the books that follow, generally estimated at two years or more? Gruzelier 1993 on *DRP* 3.154ff. perfectly catches the rhetorical artificiality of the imagery of long decay; the metapoetic explanation is mine.

26. Richardson 1974 on *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 17; Foley 1993, 36.

27. Sicilian version: Richardson 1974, 76–77; Hinds 1987, 53 and notes.

28. See Hall 1969 on *DRP* 1.122: "*Aetnaeae* or *Hennaeeae*? Heinsius makes out a case for preferring the latter reading, which is found in $C_1 O_1 O_2 (R_4)$." Hall himself, however, dismisses *any* reference to Enna in his extended note, which shapes the current consensus, along with Charlet (1987, 25–29), who expands upon Hall and adds useful tables; so also Gruzelier 1993 ad *DRP* 1.122 (with a hint of buyer's remorse?) and Guipponi-Gineste 2010, 43–44. The choice between forms of *Aetn-* and *Henn-* has to be made at *DRP* 1.122; 2.72, 289; 3.85, 220. In all these cases Koch's 1893 Teubner had favored *Henn-*. Still to the point are several of the arguments set out in his *adnotationes criticae* on *DRP* 1.122. Platnauer's 1922 Loeb, influenced by Birt, chooses *Henn-* in the three listed passages from books 1 and 2 but *Aetn-* in the two passages from book 3 (but at 3.220 his translation names Enna!). Birt's own vacillations on the matter are addressed by Koch.

29. For Etna in the tradition of the rape, see again Hall 1969 on *DRP* 1.122, including (importantly for his position) a handful of references that indubitably associate

the flower gathering with the mountain: Plut. *Mor.* 917F; Hyg. *Fab.* 146; Lactant. Plac. on Stat. *Theb.* 5.347; Auson. *Epist.* 13.49 Green: “floricoma . . . in Aetna.”

30. A telling case here (in one of Claudian’s favorite poems) is Stat. *Achil.* 1.824–26: “qualis Siculae sub rupibus Aetnae / Naiadas Hennaes inter Diana feroxque / Pallas et Elysii lucebat sponsa tyranni” (“even as, beneath the rocks of Sicilian Etna, Diana and fierce Pallas and the promised bride of the Elysian monarch shone forth among the Naiads of Enna”). This passage, cited by Hall for the Etna tradition of the rape, is actually more notable for its close juxtaposition of Etna and Enna; and, most tellingly, it encapsulates the tendency for Enna to be displaced by Etna in the textual tradition whenever both are in play. *Hennaes* is the broadly accepted restoration of Gronovius, where the MSS all indicate *Aetnaes*: paradoxically, it is the immediately preceding *Aetnae* that on this occasion exposes *Aetnaes* as wrong and redundant (so Dilke 1954, ad loc.).

31. I owe this further emphasis *per litteras* to Sallie Spence, whose work on Sicily and myths of empire from Cicero to Dante is eagerly awaited.

32. The parallel is registered by some commentators, but not its rhetorical implication as a near-repetition.

33. Guipponi-Gineste (2010, 43) notes the convergence with Cicero, and allows that Claudian here describes Etna in terms more appropriate to Enna—but without wavering from her insistence on Etna (after Charlet 1987) here and throughout.

34. In Cicero’s *Verrine* treatment (*Verr.* 4.111), the religious linkage between Ceres and Enna could hardly be more emphatic: “etenim urbs illa non urbs videtur, sed fanum Cereris esse; habitare apud sese Cererem Hennenses arbitrantur, ut mihi non cives illius civitatis, sed omnes sacerdotes, omnes accolae atque antistites Cereris esse videantur” (“for indeed that town is felt to be no mere town, but a sanctuary of Ceres; the people of Enna believe that Ceres dwells in their midst, and I therefore think of them not as the citizens of that city, but all of them as the priests, all of them as the servants and ministers of Ceres”); cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 4.421–22.

35. Hopkinson 1984 on Callim. *Hymn* 6.30, “Envq: “In Greek literature the word is consistently unaspirated; in Lat. generally Henna, confirmed by a fifth-century B.C. coin: *RE* 8.284.” Hence my designation of the proposed pun as “mildly macaronic.”

36. In Claudian’s repetition the color adjective switches from the lilies to the violets and from a bright hue to a dark one. On the abbreviation of the *Metamorphoses*’ two-flower catalogue (which carries its own intertextual point), see Hinds 1987, 78–80; the parallel catalogue in the *Fasti* version (4.437–42) is more extensive.

37. Here, if anywhere, is a verbal configuration close enough to take us beyond the agnosticism of Richardson (1974, 72–73) and Hall (1969, 107) on the matter of the *Homeric Hymn*’s direct influence upon Claudian.

38. Richardson 1974, 74, 79, and ad *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 8; Foley 1993, 34, 60; Paus. 9.31.9.

39. Dis is, of course, concerned here to accentuate the Elysian rather than the Tartarean aspect of his realm: cf. especially Verg. *Aen.* 6.640–41. If this were an essay on Claudian's *Vergilianism*, now would be the time to flag the delicious moment, immediately following (DRP 2.290–93), at which Dis offers Proserpina the Golden Bough as a wedding present: excellent discussion in Gruzelier 1993, ad loc.

40. DRP 2.289: “perpetui flores”; *Met.* 5.390–91 (of Enna): “frigora dant rami, varios humus umida flores: / perpetuum ver est” (“the branches give coolness and the damp earth a variety of flowers: perpetual spring is there”).

41. Here above all it is necessary to insist on “tua . . . Henna” against the “tua . . . Aetna” currently in favor. The point seems not to have been made that for Dis to conjure up a second Etna here (instead of a second Enna) would be confusing and redundant: Etna, with its pinned-down giant, *already* belongs both to the upper world and to the nether world, alike in mythology at large and in the DRP (e.g., 2.156–62).

42. For the implicit poetological contrast between eastern and western sites of the rape in *Met.* 5.385–87, see Hinds 1987, 44–47, noting the suggestiveness of Strabo, *Geog.* 14.1.45, which has the locals of Carian Nysa using a famous Homeric tag (*Il.* 2.461) to place the abduction of Persephone “in the Asian meadow, around the streams of Cayster.” For the rhetorical and geographical complications of the comparisons at Callim. *Hymn* 6.29–30, see Hopkinson 1984, ad loc.

43. The lines skipped in my quotation of the Milton passage, which add a second pagan (non-) comparison for Eden and the story of Eve (others follow at 275–85), are themselves an instance of circumstantial Ovidianism. See *Paradise Lost* 4.272–74: “nor that sweet grove / Of Daphne by Orontes, and the inspired / Castalian spring.” That is, the reference to Proserpina's misadventure at Enna attracts a complementary Ovidian reference to the site of the first erotic misadventure in the *Metamorphoses*—with (Milton being Milton) some learned syncretism in the geography (Fowler 2007, ad loc.). Contrast the straightforwardly Ovidian Daphne in the comparisons of Spenser, *Faerie Queene* 2.12.52, here recalled by Milton (Fowler 2007, on *PL* 4.268–85).

44. The term used also by Guipponi-Gineste 2010, 61–63, to situate DRP 3.332–56 within a treatment of “la géographie symbolique du *De Raptu Proserpinae*.”

45. Gigantomachic imagery and themes in the DRP: Hinds 2013, 180–82 (with bibliography); Ware 2012, 129–31.

46. The ecphrastic formula is modulated thus between DRP 3.332 and 358: “lucus erat . . . illic . . . hic . . . hic . . . inde timor numenque loco . . . accenditur ultro / religione loci.” On such paronomasia of *locus*, *lucus* (and *lacus*: cf. DRP 2.101 with 112) as a feature of the formulae of Ovidian landscape ecphrasis, see (on *Met.* 5.385–91 specifically) Hinds 1987, 35–42, and notes, and (on the *Metamorphoses* more broadly) Hinds 2002, 122–30.

47. For specific echoes of Caesar's invasion of the forest at Massilia (Luc. *BC* 3.399–452), see Gruzelier 1993 on DRP 3.332ff., citing earlier discussions; just as striking is the Lucanian ambience of the whole. Intriguing in this context is Roberts 1989,

26n33, on the evocation at *DRP* 3.344 of *BC* 1.135, “stat magni nominis umbra” (“he stands the shadow of a great name”), of Pompey, compared by Lucan directly afterward to a tree that (like these) is trophy-laden but on the brink of collapse.

48. *DRP* 3.370: “tollebant geminae capita inviolata cupressi”; 376–77: “hae placuere faces: pernix invadit utramque / cincta sinus, exerta manus, armata bipenni.” (“Twin cypresses raised their inviolate heads. . . . These won her approval as torches: briskly she assailed each one, the folds of her robe girt up, her arms bared, with an axe as her weapon.”)

49. A “daring reversal”: von Albrecht 1989, 389, again (cf. n. 18) brief but excellent on the Ovidian dimension of the *DRP*.

50. The intertextually repeated “non tamen . . .” immediately flags the move. With *Ov. Met.* 8.757 (of Erysichthon) “telum librat,” compare *DRP* 3.358 (of Ceres) “vibratque . . . securim” (*libratque* D [!]). At 359 editors disagree as to whether Claudian would countenance the irregular quantity in *feritura*, admitted by late antique writers less classical than he: there is no agreed alternative, but the general sense of the half-line is not in doubt.

51. Callim. *Hymn* 6.8–9, 17: “Ἑσπερος, ὅστε πιεῖν Δαμάτερὰ μῶνος ἔπεισεν / ἀρπαγίμας ὅκ’ ἄπυστα μετέστιχεν ἰχθία κώρας . . . / μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμεν ἃ δάκρυον ἄγαγε Διοῖ.” (“Hesperus, who alone persuaded Demeter to drink when she was on the track of her daughter, stolen she knew not whither . . . Nay, nay, let us not speak of that which brought tears to Deo.”) On this way of reading Callim. *Hymn* 6.8–21, cf. Hinds 1987, 155n28.

52. *DRP* 3.85: “roseis . . . convallibus Hennae” [*sic*].

53. *DRP* 3.120: “terret nimium vulgata” reverberates also, perhaps, with the “terror” associated with the “divulgarion” of sacred mysteries, an aspect of Ceres’s myth and cult newly foregrounded in Claudian’s time by the shutting down and subsequent desecration of the Eleusinian sanctuaries (after their brief revival under Julian) in 392–96 CE—a consideration no less relevant to (say) *DRP* 1.25–26: Hinds 2013, 186–87.

54. A replay, with variation, of Venus’s meddling role at *Ov. Met.* 5.363–84: Gruzelier 1993 on *DRP* 1.214ff. and 223–24.

55. In support of the idea that there is something post-Ovidian about the very move to “emplot” the *laudes loci* habit in this way, one might adduce, say, *Ov. Met.* 2.445–48, with Hinds 2002, 129–30.

56. An affinity between the *Homeric Hymn* and the *DRP* acutely pointed out by Gruzelier 1993 on *DRP* 3.196ff. Ovid had responded in his own archly allusive ways in *Met.* 5 to the *Homeric Hymn*’s repetition of the flower-plucking scene: see Hinds 1987, 78–80 (on *Met.* 5.392) and 91–93 (on Arethusa’s intradiegetic narrative as a kind of displacement of Persephone’s intradiegetic narrative in the *Hymn*).

57. Once again, however (as at *DRP* 2.112 and 128–29), these lines do show specific verbal and rhetorical traces of Ovid’s “haud procul Hennaeis . . .” ecpheasis at *Met.*

5.385–95, not, I think, picked up by those who address the textual issue. With *DRP* 3.226, “dum loca miratur, studio dum flagrat eundi,” compare the redoubled “dum . . . dumque” at *Ov. Met.* 5.391–93: “quo dum Proserpina luco / ludit et aut violas aut candida lilia carpit, / dumque puellari studio . . .” (“while Proserpina was playing in this grove and plucking either violets or white lilies, and while with girlish eagerness . . .”). *Hennaea*, then, against almost all the MSS, not *Aetnaea*.

58. Ceres’s worldwide search foreshadowed at *DRP* 1.28–29: “quantasque per oras / sollicito genetrix erraverit anxia cursu” (“and over how many shores the anxious mother wandered on her troubled course”): cf. the multiple geographical catalogues of *Ov. Fast.* 4, and also the arch *praeteritio* of *Met.* 5.462–64: “quas dea per terras et quas erraverit undas, / dicere longa mora est; quaerenti defuit orbis. / Sicaniam repetit . . .” [1]. (“Over what lands and what seas the goddess wandered it would take a long time to tell; the world was not enough for the searcher. She returned to Sicily . . .”) And finally, of course, cf. the other travel catalogues in the *Metamorphoses* upon which Claudian would likely have drawn: e.g., Medea’s in book 7.

59. Hinds 2013, 189–91: “it is appropriate to record that at the unfinished end of the *DRP* Claudian joins the ranks of Latin epic poets ambushed by death or other mishap into a final problematization of epic closure; an accidental series which is itself programmed into a kind of intentionality by the inaugural example of Vergil, with his biographically underwritten failure to apply the *summa manus* to the *Aeneid*. In different ways, the *Metamorphoses*, the *Bellum Civile* and the *Achilleid* are key members of this series.” (The ensuing discussion remarks on the odd fact that the *DRP*’s break-off line contains a *pars . . . pars . . .* construction.)

60. On Scylla (“one of the ‘It’ girls of Alexandrizing neoteric poetry,” in the happy phrase of Alison Keith at the Tallahassee event) as self-conscious crux, see especially Verg. *Ecl.* 6.74–77, with Clausen 1994 on 74, and [Verg.] *Ciris* 54–91, with Lyne 1978 on 54. For Ovid’s embrace of the confusion, see *Am.* 3.12.19–22; *Her.* 12.123–24 with Hinds 1993, 15 and n14; *Ars am.* 1.331–32, with Hollis 1977, ad loc.; *Rem. am.* 737; *Met.* 8.120–21, with Kenney 2011, ad loc.; and (quoted here) *Fast.* 4.500, with Fantham 1998, ad loc., and Hinds 1984.

61. In context, the right metonymy but the wrong father. For the programmatic reference implicit in “naufra monstra” (*Fast.* 4.500), see Hinds 1984.

Works Cited

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of classical references follow S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
AU	<i>Der altsprachliche Unterricht</i>
BAGB	<i>Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i>
BICS	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
CA	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
C&M	<i>Classica et mediaevalia</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
CP	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CSCA	<i>California Studies in Classical Antiquity</i>
CW	<i>Classical World</i>
DHQ	<i>Digital Humanities Quarterly</i>
EMC	<i>Échos du monde classique</i>
EuGeStA	<i>Journal on Gender Studies in Antiquity</i>
GB	<i>Grazer Beiträge: Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft</i>
GIF	<i>Giornale italiano di filologia</i>
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
ICS	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
LCM	<i>Liverpool Classical Monthly</i>

- LICS *Leeds International Classical Studies*
 MAAR *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*
 MD *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*
 NewLitHist *New Literary History*
 PCPS *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
 PLLS 1–5 *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*
 PLLS 6–10 *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*
 PVS *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*
 QUCC *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica*
 RFIC *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*
 RhM *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
 RIL *Rendiconti: Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche*
 SIFC *Studi italiani di filologia classica*
 SLLRH *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*
 SO *Symbolae Osloenses*
 TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*
 WJA *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*
 YFS *Yale French Studies*
- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ahl, Frederick. 1985. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 1986. "Statius' *Thebaid*: A Reconsideration." *ANRW* 2.32.5:2804–912.
- Alden, Maureen J. 1997. "The Resonances of the Song of Ares and Aphrodite." *Mnemosyne* 50:513–29.
- Allen, Graham. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Allen, Thomas W. 1917. *Homeri Opera, Tomus III: Odysseae Libros I–XII continens*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1931. *Homeri Ilias*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Alton, E. H., D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- . 1997. *Ovidius: Fasti*. 4th ed. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.
- Anderson, William S. 1972. *Ovid, Metamorphoses, Books 6–10*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- . 1982. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Arend, Walter. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Aricò, Giuseppe. 1960. "Sul mito di Lino e Corebo in Stat. *Theb.* I 557–668." *RFIC* 88:277–91.
- Augoustakis, Anthony, ed. 2013. *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Baier, Thomas. 2001. *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica Buch VI*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Bakker, Egbert J. 2013. *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baldo, Gianluigi. 1986. "Il codice epico nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio." *MD* 16:109–31.
- Barber, E. J. W. 1992. "The Peplos of Athena." In *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, edited by Jennifer Neils, 103–17. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1991. "Discordant Muses." *PCPS* 37:1–21.
- . 1993. "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*." *HSCP* 95:333–65.
- . 1997. "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6." In *Classical Closure*, edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don P. Fowler, 181–208. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1999. "Venus' Masterplot: Ovid and the Homeric Hymns." In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and Its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 112–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2001a. "Genealogie letterarie nell'epica imperiale: Fondamentalismo e ironia." In *L'Histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine: Huit exposés suivis de discussions*, edited by Jürgen Paul Schwindt, 315–54. Entretiens Fondation Hardt 47. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.
- . 2001b. "Voices and Narrative 'Instances' in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, 50–78. London: Duckworth.
- , ed. 2005. *Ovidio Metamorfosi*. Vol. 1, *Libri I–II*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Mondadori.
- . 2009. "Phaethon and the Monsters." In *Paradox and the Marvelous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, edited by Philip Hardie, 161–88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro, and Gianpiero Rosati. 2007. *Ovidio Metamorfosi*. Vol. 2, *Libri III–IV*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Mondadori.
- Barkan, Leonard. 1986. *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1978. *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bartholomé, Heinrich. 1935. "Ovid und die antike Kunst." PhD diss., Universität Münster.
- Barton, Tamsyn. 1994. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1995. "Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric." *JRS* 85:33–51.

- Bass, R. C. 1977. "Some Aspects of the Structure of the Phaethon Episode in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CQ* 27:402–8.
- Baumbach, Manuel. 2012. "Borderline Experiences with Genre: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* between Epic, Hymn and Epyllic Poetry." In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, edited by Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär, 135–48. Leiden: Brill.
- Beard, Mary. 1999. "The Erotics of Rape: Livy, Ovid and the Sabine Women." In *Female Networks and the Public Sphere*, edited by Päivi Setälä and Liisa Savunen, 1–10. Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae.
- Beller, Manfred. 1979. *Jupiter Tonans: Studien zur Darstellung der Macht in der Poesie*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Berger, Anne-Emmanuelle, and Rachel Gabara. 1996. "The Latest Word from Echo." *NewLitHist* 27:621–40.
- Bernstein, Neil W. 2008. *In the Image of the Ancestors*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bernstein, Neil W., Kyle Gervais, and Wei Lin. Forthcoming. "Comparative Rates of Text Reuse in Latin Hexameter Poetry." *DHQ* 9.3.
- Bettini, Maurizio. 1999. *The Portrait of the Lover*. Translated by Laura Gibbs. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bierl, Anton. 2012. "Demodokos' Song of Ares and Aphrodite in Homer's *Odyssey* (8.266–366): An Epyllion?—Agonistic Performativity and Cultural Metapoetics." In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, edited by Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär, 111–34. Leiden: Brill.
- Bloom, Harold. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bömer, Franz. 1957–58. *Die Fasten*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- . 1969. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Kommentar Buch I–III*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- . 1976. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Kommentar Buch IV–V*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- . 1980. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Kommentar Buch X–XI*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- . 1982. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Kommentar Buch XII–XIII*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Bonadeo, Alessia. 2002. "Il pianto di Eco: Riflessioni sulla presenza dell'eco in alcune trasposizione letterarie del *planctus*." *QUCC* 71:133–45.
- Boyd, Barbara Weiden. 2000a. "Celabatur Auctor: The Crisis of Authority and Narrative Patterning in Ovid *Fasti* 5." *Phoenix* 54:64–98.
- . 2000b. *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- . 2006. "Two Rivers and the Reader in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8." *TAPA* 136: 171–206.
- . 2012. "On Starting an Epic (Journey): Telemachus, Phaethon, and the Beginning of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *MD* 69:101–18.
- Braswell, Bruce K. 1982. "The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: Theme and Relevance in *Odyssey* 8." *Hermes* 110:129–37.
- Brenkman, John. 1976. "Narcissus in the Text." *Georgia Review* 30:293–327.
- Brillet-Dubois, Pascale. 2011. "An Erotic *Aristeia*: The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and Its Relationship to the Epic Tradition." In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner, 105–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Broege, Valerie. 1972. "Ovid's Autobiographical Use of Mythology in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*." *EMC* 16:37–42.
- Brookes, Ian N. 1992. "A Literary Commentary on the Fifth Book of Ovid's *Fasti*." PhD diss., University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Brown, Christopher G. 1989. "Ares, Aphrodite, and the Laughter of the Gods." *Phoenix* 43:283–93.
- Brown, Joanne. 1994. "Into the Woods: Narrative Studies in the *Thebaid* of Statius with Special Reference to Books IV–VI." PhD diss., Cambridge University.
- Brown, Robert. 1987. "The Palace of the Sun in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, edited by Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie, and Mary Whitby, 211–20. Bristol: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bruère, Richard T. 1958. "Color Ovidianus in Silius *Punica* 1–7." In *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, edited by Nicolae I. Herescu, 475–99. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- . 1959. "Color Ovidianus in Silius *Punica* 8–17." *CP* 54:228–45.
- Bureau, Bruno. 2009. "Figures de poètes chez Claudien: Des manifestes poétiques?" In *Manifestes littéraires dans la latinité tardive: Poétique et rhétorique*, edited by Perrine Galand-Hallyn and Vincent Zarini, 51–70. Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustines.
- Burgess, Jonathan. 1995. "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth." *CA* 14:217–44.
- . 2009. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burkert, Walter. 1960. "Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite." *RhM* 103:130–44.
- . 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Translated by Walter Burkert and Margaret E. Pinder. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cameron, Alan. 1970. *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- . 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. "Young Achilles in the Roman World." *JRS* 99:1–22.
- Casali, Sergio. 1995. "Altre voci nell' *Eneide* di Ovidio." *MD* 35:59–76.
- . 2006. "The Art of Making Oneself Hated: Rethinking (Anti-)Augustanism in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." In *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, edited by Bruce Gibson, Stephen Green, and Alison Sharrock, 216–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. "Correcting Aeneas' Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3." *TAPA* 137:181–210.
- Caviglia, Franco. 1973. *P. Papinio Stazio: La Tebaide—Libro I*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Charlet, Jean-Louis. 1987. "L'Etna, la rose et le sang: Critique textuelle et symbolisme dans le *De raptu Proserpinae* de Claudien." *Invigilata Lucernis* 9:25–44.
- . 1991. *Claudien, Oeuvres*. Vol. 1, *Le rapt de Proserpine*. Paris: Association Guillaume Budé.
- Ciappi, Maurizio. 2000. "La narrazione ovidiana del mito di Fetonte e le sue fonti: L'importanza della tradizione tragica." *Athenaeum* 88:117–68.
- Ciccarelli, Irma. 2003. *Commento al II libro dei Tristia di Ovidio*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Claassen, Jo-Marie. 1999. "The Vocabulary of Exile in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*." *Glotta* 75:134–71.
- Clark, Matthew. 2004. "Formulas, Metre, and Type-scenes." In *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, edited by Robert Fowler, 117–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clausen, Wendell. 1994. *Virgil: Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Clausen, W. V., and E. J. Kenney, eds. 1982. *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2, *Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2006. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- . 2011. "The Homeric Hymns as Genre." In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner, 232–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coffee, Neil. 2013. "Intertextuality in Latin Poetry." *Oxford Bibliographies in Classics*. Oxfordbibliographies.com.
- Coffee, Neil, Jean-Pierre Koenig, Shakthi Poornima, Roelant Ossewaarde, Chris Forstall, and Sarah Jacobson. 2012a. "Intertextuality in the Digital Age." *TAPA* 142:381–419.
- . 2012b. "The Tesserae Project: Intertextual Analysis of Latin Poetry." *Literary and Linguistic Computing*. <http://llc.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/2007/2020/llc.fqs2033.abstract>.

- Coleman, Robert. 1971. "Structure and Intention in the *Metamorphoses*." *CQ* 21: 461–77.
- Collard, Christopher, and Martin Cropp. 2008. *Euripides: Fragments* (Aegeus-Meleager). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Vergil and Other Latin Poets*. Edited by Charles Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cooper, Frederic T. 1895. "Word Formation in the Roman *Sermo Plebeius*." PhD diss., Columbia University.
- Corbett, John H. 1974. "The Succession Policy of Augustus." *Latomus* 33:87–97.
- Crabbe, Anna. 1981. "Structure and Content in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *ANRW* 2.31.4:2274–327.
- Crook, John A. 1996. "Political History, 30 B.C. to A.D. 14." *CAH²* 10:70–112.
- Curley, Dan. 2013. *Tragedy in Ovid: Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of Genre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curran, Leo. 1978. "Rape and Rape Victims in the *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 11:213–41.
- Davie, John, trans. 1998. *Electra and Other Plays: Euripides*. New York: Penguin.
- Davis, Gregson. 1980. "The Problem of Closure in a *Carmen Perpetuum*: Aspects of Thematic Recapitulation in Ovid *Met.* 15." *GB* 9:123–32.
- . 1983. *The Death of Procris: Amor and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Davis, Martha A. 1990. "Ratis audax: Valerius Flaccus' Bold Ship." In *The Imperial Muse: Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire*, edited by Anthony J. Boyle, 46–73. Victoria, Australia: Aural Publications.
- Davis, Peter J. 1993. "The Fabric of History in Statius' *Thebaid*." *SLLRH* 7:464–83.
- . 1994. "The Fabric of History in Statius' *Thebaid*." In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 7, edited by Carl Deroux, 464–83. Brussels: Latomus.
- . 2006. "Allusion to Ovid and Others in Statius' *Achilleid*." *Ramus* 35:129–43.
- degl'Innocenti Pierini, Rita. 1985. "Caligola come Fetonte (Sen. *Ad Pol.* 17.3)." *GIF* 37:73–89.
- de Jong, Irene. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delarue, Ferdinand. 2000. *Stace, poète épique: Originalité et cohérence*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Delz, Josef. 1987. *Sili Italici Punica*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Diggle, James. 1984. *Euripidis Fabulae*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dilke, O. A. W. 1954. *Statius, Achilleid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DiLorenzo, Kate M. 2001. "Looking Both Ways: Janus, Doubling, and Intertextuality in Ovid." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Dippel, Manfred. 1990. *Die Darstellung des trojanischen Krieges in Ovids Metamorphosen (XII 1–XIII 622)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Doblhofer, Ernst. 1973. "Ovid ein 'Urvater der Résistance'?" Beobachtungen zur Phaethonerzählung in den *Metamorphosen*, 1,747–2, 400." In *400 Jahre Akademisches Gymnasium Graz. Festschrift*, edited by Wilhelm Danhofer, 143–54. Graz: Verlag des Akademisches Gymnasium in Graz.
- Dominik, William J. 1994. *The Mythic Voice of Statius: Power and Politics in the Thebaid*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. "The Reception of Silius Italicus in Modern Scholarship." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 425–47. Leiden: Brill.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Due, Otto Steen. 1974. *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Dufallo, Basil. 2013. *The Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman Ecphrasis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eaton, Annette H. 1943. "The Influence of Ovid on Claudian." PhD diss., Catholic University of America.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1992. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene." *Oral Tradition* 7:284–330.
- Ehlers, Widu-Wolfgang. 1980. *Gai Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon Libri Octo*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Erren, Manfred. 2003. *P. Vergilius Maro, Georgica. Vol. 2, Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Evans, Harry B. 1983. *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fabre-Serris, Jacqueline. 1995. *Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide: Fonctions et significations de la mythologie dans la Rome augustéenne*. Lille: Klincksieck.
- Fairclough, H. Rushton. 1918. *Virgil: Aeneid VII–XII and the Minor Poems*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fairweather, Janet. 1987. "Ovid's Autobiographical Poem, *Tristia* 4.10." *CQ* 37:181–96.
- Fantham, R. Elaine. 1983a. "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation." *HSCP* 87:185–216.
- . 1983b. "*Sunt quibus in plures ius est transire figuras*: Ovid's Self-Transformers in the *Metamorphoses*." *CW* 87:21–36.
- . 1985. "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the *Fasti*." *PLLS* 5:243–81.
- . 1992a. "Lucan's Medusa Excursus: *De Bello Civili* 9.619–99: Its Design and Purpose." *MD* 29:95–119.
- . 1992b. "The Role of Evander in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Arethusa* 25:155–71.
- . 1998. *Ovid, Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Farrell, Joseph. 1992. "The Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's Lovesong of Polyphemus (*Metamorphoses* 13.719–897)." *AJP* 113:237–68.
- . 2005. "Intention and Intertext." *Phoenix* 59:98–111.
- Faulkner, Andrew. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feeney, Denis C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1999. "Mea tempora: Patterning of Time in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and Its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 13–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. "Tenue . . . Latens Discrimine: Spotting the Differences in Statius' *Achilleid*." *MD* 52:85–105.
- . 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Feldherr, Andrew. 1997. "Metamorphosis and Sacrifice in Ovid's Theban narrative." *MD* 38:25–55.
- . 2002. "Metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 163–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Felgentreu, Fritz. 1999. *Claudians praefationes: Bedingungen, Beschreibungen und Wirkungen einer poetischen Kleinform*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Felson, Nancy. 2011. "Children of Zeus in the *Homeric Hymns*: Generational Succession." In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner, 254–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, Ute. 1969. "Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus." PhD diss., Freieuniversität Berlin.
- Foley, Helene P. 1993. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fontenrose, Joseph E. 1940. "Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid." *AJP* 61:429–44.
- . 1959. *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Forbes Irving, P. M. C. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Forstall, Christopher, Neil Coffee, Thomas Buck, Katherine Roache, and Sarah Jacobson. 2014. "Modeling the Scholars: Detecting Intertextuality through Enhanced Word-Level N-Gram Matching." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* (December).
- Fowler, Alastair. 2007. *Milton: Paradise Lost*. Rev. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.
- Fränkel, Hermann. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Fratantuono, Lee. 2011. *Madness Transformed: A Reading of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Friedländer, Paul. 1912. *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius: Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Fulkerson, Laurel. 2006. "Apollo, Paenitentia, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Mnemosyne* 59:388–402.
- . 2016. *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Galasso, Luigi. 2000. *Ovidio, Opere II: Le metamorfosi*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretative Introduction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1998. "The Speech of Pythagoras at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15.75–478." *PLLS* 10:313–36.
- Galand-Hallyn, Perrine. 1990. "Art descriptif et argumentation dans la poésie latine." In *Figures et Conflits Rhetoriques*, edited by Michel Meyer and Alain Lempereur, 39–57. Brussels: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Galli, Daniela. 2013. "Recusatio in Flavian Epic Poetry: Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* (1.7–21) and Statius' *Thebaid* (1.17–33)." In *Flavian Epic Interactions*, edited by Gesine Manuwald and Astrid Voigt, 55–66. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ganiban, Randall. 2007. *Statius and Virgil: The Thebaid and the Reinterpretation of the Aeneid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Genzenmüller, Carl. 1911. "Aus Ovids Werkstatt." *Philologus* 70:274–311, 397–437.
- Garani, Myrto. 2011. "Revisiting Tarpeia's Myth in Propertius (IV, 4)." *LICS* 10:1–22.
- Garvie, A. F. 1994. *Homer: Odyssey Books VII–VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, Emma. 2000. *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilchrist, Katie E. 1989. "Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.476." *CQ* 39:562.
- Gildenhard, Ingo, and Andrew Zissos. 1999. "Problems of Time in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 2." In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and Its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 31–47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. "Ovid's Narcissus (*Met.* 3.339–510): Echoes of Oedipus." *AJP* 121: 129–48.
- . 2004. "Ovid's 'Hecale': Deconstructing Athens in the *Metamorphoses*." *JRS* 94:47–72.
- Gladhill, Bill. 2012. "Gods, Caesars and Fate in *Aeneid* 1 and *Metamorphoses* 15." *Dictynna* 9. <http://dictynna.revues.org/820>.

- . 2013. "The *Domus* of Fama and Republican Space in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Damien Nelis, 297–318. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goold, George P. 1998. *M. Manilii Astronomica*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Gossage, A. J. 1959. "Statius and Virgil." *Virgil Society Lecture Summaries* 47:1–8.
- Gow, A. S. F., and A. F. Scholfield. 1953. *Nicander of Colophon: Poems and Poetical Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Green, Steven J., and Katharina Volk, eds. 2011. *Forgotten Stars: Rediscovering Manilius' Astronomica*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Griffin, Jasper. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97:39–53.
- Gross, Nicholas P. 2000. "Allusion and Rhetorical Wit in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13." *Scholia* 9:54–65.
- Gruen, Erich. 2005. "Augustus and the Making of the Principate." In *The Cambridge Companion to Augustus*, edited by G. Karl Galinsky, 33–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gruzelier, Claire. 1993. *Claudian: De Raptu Proserpinae*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Guipponi-Gineste, Marie-France. 2010. *Claudian: Poète du monde à la cour d'Occident*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Gurd, Sean A. 2012. *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Håkanson, Lennart. 1986. "Adverbs in Latin Poetry." *Eranos* 84:23–56.
- Hall, J. B. 1969. *Claudian: De raptu Proserpinae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1985. *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Halliwell, Stephen. 2008. *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Sociology from Homer to Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ham, Charles T. 2013. "Empedoclean Elegy: Love, Strife and the Four Elements in Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Fasti*." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Harder, Annette. 2012. *Callimachus, Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1988. "Lucretius and the Delusions of Narcissus." *MD* 20–21:71–89.
- . 1989. "Flavian Epicists on Virgil's Epic Technique." *Ramus* 16:3–20.
- . 1990. "Ovid's Theban History: The First 'Anti-Aeneid'?" *CQ* 40:224–35.
- . 1991. "The Janus Episode in Ovid's *Fasti*." *MD* 26:47–64.
- . 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1995. "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean Epos." *CQ* 45:204–14.

- . 1997. "Questions of Authority: The Invention of Tradition in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15." In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, edited by Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, 182–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. "Approximative Similes in Ovid: Incest and Doubling." *Dictynna* 1. <http://dictynna.revues.org/166>.
- . 2005. "Nonnus' Typhon: The Musical Giant." In *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*, edited by Michael Paschalis, 117–30. Rethymnon Classical Studies 2. Herakleion: Crete University Press.
- . 2012. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, Stephen J. Forthcoming. "Metapoetics in the Prefaces of Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae*." In *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, edited by Jaś Elsner and Jesús Hernández Lobato. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heath, John. 1991. "Diana's Understanding of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CJ* 86:233–43.
- Heerink, Mark. 2013. "Silius versus Valerius: Orpheus in the *Punica* and *Argonautica*." In *Flavian Epic Interactions*, edited by Gesine Manuwald and Astrid Voigt, 267–78. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Heinrich, Albert. 1999. "Longa Retro Series: Sacrifice and Repetition in Statius' Menoeceus Episode." *Arethusa* 22:165–95.
- Heinze, Richard. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse 71.7. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hejduk, Julia Dyson. 2011. "Epic Rapes in the *Fasti*." *CP* 106:20–31.
- Helzle, Martin. 1989. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber IV: A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Henry, Madeleine, and Sharon L. James. 2012. "Woman, City, State: Theories and Concepts in the Archaic and Classical Periods." In *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*, edited by Sharon L. James and Sheila Dillon, 84–95. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hershkowitz, Debra. 1998. *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica: Abbreviated Voyages in Silver Latin Epic*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Herter, Hans. 1950. "Böse Dämonen im frühgriechischen Volksglauben." *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 1:112–43.
- . 1958. "Ovids Verhältnis zur bildenden Kunst." In *Ovidiana*, edited by Nicolae I. Herescu, 49–74. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Heslin, Peter. 2005. *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011. "Metapoetic Pseudonyms in Horace, Propertius and Ovid." *JRS* 101: 51–72.
- Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Books I–VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Heuvel, Herman. 1932. *Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber primus*. Zutphen: Nauta.

- Heyworth, Stephen J. 2013. "Keeping on Keeping on: Repetition in the Propertian Narrative." Oxford Research Archives. <http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:0e07d210-8b2d-46fi-8b39-c19aae8b8b20>.
- Hill, Donald E. 1983. *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri XII*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1999. *Ovid Metamorphoses IX–XII*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- . 2000. *Ovid Metamorphoses XIII–XV*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Hinds, Stephen E. 1984. "Cave canem: Ovid, *Fasti* 4.500." *LCM* 9:79.
- . 1985. "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* I." *PCPS* 31:13–32.
- . 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1992. "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti* Part 1: Genre and Mannerism." *Arethusa* 25:81–112.
- . 1993. "Ovid's Medea: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine." *MD* 30:9–47.
- . 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999. "After Exile: Time and Teleology from *Metamorphoses* to *Ibis*." In *Ovidian Transformations*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 48–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. "Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius." In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*, edited by Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink, 221–44. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2002. "Landscape with Figures: Aesthetics of Place in the *Metamorphoses* and Its Tradition." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 122–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2005. "Dislocations of Ovidian Time." In *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne*, edited by Jürgen Paul Schwindt, 203–30. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- . 2007. "Martial's Ovid/Ovid's Martial." *JRS* 97:113–54.
- . 2011. "Seneca's Ovidian Loci." *SIFC* 9:5–63.
- . 2013. "Claudianism in the *De Raptu Proserpinae*." In *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature*, edited by Theodore D. Papangelis, Stephen J. Harrison, and Stavros Frangoulidis, 169–92. Trends in Classics Suppl. 20. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hollander, John. 1981. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hollis, Adrian S. 1973. "The *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." In *Ovid*, edited by J. W. Binns, 84–115. London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
- . 1977. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book I*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC–AD 20*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holzberg, Niklas. 1990. "Ovids Version der Ehebruchsnovelle von Ares und Aphrodite (Hom. *Od.* 8.266–366) in der *Ars amatoria* (2.561–92)." *WJA* 16:137–52.

- . 1998. "Ter Quinque Volumina as *Carmen Perpetuum*: The Division into Books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *MD* 40:77–98.
- Hopkinson, Neil. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Horstmann, Sabine. 2004. *Das Epithalamium in der lateinischen Literatur der Spätantike*. Munich: Saur.
- Housman, Alfred E. 1903. *M. Manilii Astronomicon liber primus*. London: Richards.
- . 1927. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hunter, Richard. 2012. "The Songs of Demodocus: Compression and Extension in Greek Narrative Poetry." In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, edited by Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär, 83–109. Leiden: Brill.
- Hurst, André, and Antje Kolde. 2008. *Lycophron*. Alexandra: Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Ingleheart, Jennifer. 2006. "What the Poet Saw: Ovid, the Error, and the Theme of Sight in *Tristia* 2." *MD* 56:63–86.
- . 2010. *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- James, Sharon L. 1995. "Establishing Rome with the Sword: *Condere* in the *Aeneid*." *AJP* 116:623–37.
- . 1997. "Slave-Rape and Female Silence in Ovid's Love Poetry." *Helios* 24: 60–76.
- . 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2008. "Feminist Pedagogy and Teaching Latin Literature." *Cloelia* 38:11–14.
- . 2014. "Talking Rape in the Classics Classroom: Further Thoughts." In *From Abortion to Pederasty: Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*, edited by Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Fiona McHardy, 171–86. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Janan, Michaela. 1994. "There beneath the Roman Ruin Where the Purple Flowers Grow': Ovid's *Minyeides* and the Feminine Imagination." *AJP* 115:427–48.
- . 2007. "Narcissus on the Text: Psychoanalysis, Exegesis, Ethics." *Phoenix* 61:286–95.
- . 2009. *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye: Thebes and Rome in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janka, Markus. 1997. *Ovid, Ars amatoria Buch 2: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Janko, Richard. 1994. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4, Books 13–16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jockers, Matthew L. 2013. *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History*. Topics in the Digital Humanities. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Johnson, Patricia. 2008. *Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Johnson, W. Ralph. 1996. "The Rapes of Callisto." *CJ* 92:9–24.
- Johnston, Sarah Iles. 1994. "Penelope and the Erinyes: *Odyssey* 20.61–82." *Helios* 21:137–59.
- . 1995. "Defining the Dreadful: Remarks on the Greek Child-Killing Demon." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Meyer and P. Mirecki, 355–81. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1997. "Corinthian Medea and the Cult of Hera Akraia." In *Medea*, edited by James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston, 44–71. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2001. "Defining the Dreadful: Remarks on the Greek Child-Killing Demon." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power in the Ancient World*, edited by Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki, 361–87. Leiden: Brill.
- Jones, Prudence J. 2001. "Aversion Reversed: Ovid's Pomona and Her Roman Models." *CW* 94:361–76.
- Joplin, Patricia K. 1984. "The Voice of the Shuttle Is Ours." *Stanford Literature Review* 1:25–53.
- . 1990. "Ritual Work on Human Flesh: Livy's Lucretia and the Rape of the Body Politic." *Helios* 17:51–60.
- Joshel, Sandra. 1992. "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Virginia." In *Pornography and Representation in the Ancient World*, edited by Amy Richlin, 112–30. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kahn, Madeline. 2005. *Why Are We Reading Ovid's Handbook on Rape? Teaching and Learning at a Women's College*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Kaster, Robert. 2001. "Controlling Reason: Declamation in Rhetorical Education at Rome." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Yun Lee Too, 317–38. Leiden: Brill.
- Keith, Alison M. 1992. *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1999a. "Epic Masculinity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Ovidian Transformations*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 214–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999b. "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory." *Mnemosyne* 52:41–62.
- . 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "Ovidian Personae in Statius' *Thebaid*." *Arethusa* 35:381–402.

- . 2004–5. “Ovid’s Theban Narrative in Statius’ *Thebaid*.” *Hermathena* 177–78:177–202.
- . 2011. “Ovid in Lucan: The Poetics of Instability.” In *Brill’s Companion to Lucan*, edited by Paolo Asso, 111–32. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013. “Medusa, Python, and *Poine* in Argive Religious Ritual.” In *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 303–17. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2014a. “Ovid and Valerius Flaccus.” In *Brill’s Companion to Valerius Flaccus*, edited by Mark Heerink and Gesine Manuwald, 269–89. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014b. “Ovidian Geographies in Flavian Mythological Epic.” In *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Aspects of Space and Its Representation in Greek and Roman Epic*, edited by Marios Skempis and Ioannis Ziogas, 349–72. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Keith, Alison M., and Stephen Rupp. 2007. “After Ovid: Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Trajectories of the *Metamorphoses*.” In *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Alison M. Keith and Stephen Rupp, 15–32. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kennedy, Duncan F. 2012. “Love’s Tropes and Figures.” In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, edited by Barbara K. Gold, 189–203. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kenney, E. J. 1979. “Two Disputed Passages in the *Heroides*.” *CQ* 29:394–431.
- . 1982. “Ovid.” In *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2, *Latin Literature*, edited by W. V. Clausen and E. J. Kenney, 420–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1995. *Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. 2nd, corrected ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1996. *Ovid, Heroides XVI–XXI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011. *Ovidio: Metamorfosi*. Vol. 4, *Libri VII–IX*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.
- Knoespel, Kenneth J. 1985. *Narcissus and the Invention of Personal History*. New York: Garland Publications in Classical Literature.
- Knox, Peter E. 1986a. “Ovid’s *Medea* and the Authenticity of *Heroides* 12.” *HSCP* 90:207–23.
- . 1986b. *Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge Philological Society Supplement 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1988. “Pyramus and Thisbe in Cyprus.” *HSCP* 92:315–28.
- . 1997. “Savagery in the *Aeneid* and Virgil’s Ancient Commentators.” *CJ* 92: 225–33.
- . 2004. “The Poet and the Second Prince: Ovid in the Age of Tiberius.” *MAAR* 49:1–20.
- . 2014. “Ovidian Myths on Pompeian Walls.” In *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, edited by Carole Newlands and John F. Miller, 36–54. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Koch, Julius. 1893. *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Konstan, David. 1991. "The Death of Argus, or What Stories Do: Audience Response in Ancient Fiction and Theory." *Helios* 18:15–30.
- Kovacs, David, trans. 1994. *Euripides: Children of Heracles; Hippolytus; Andromache; Hecuba*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Krasne, Darcy A. 2011. "Mythic Recursions: Doubling and Variation in the Mythological Works of Ovid and Valerius Flaccus." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Labate, Mario. 1993. "Storie di instabilità: L'episodio di Ermafrodito nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio." *MD* 30:49–62.
- Lateiner, Donald. 2006. "Procul este parentes: Mothers in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Helios* 33:189–201.
- Leach, Eleanor W. 1974. "Ekphrasis and the Theme of Artistic Failure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Ramus* 3:102–42.
- Légras, Léon. 1905. *Étude sur la Thébaïde de Stace*. Paris: Société nouvelle de librairie et d'édition.
- Lightfoot, Jane L. 2009. "Ovid and Hellenistic Poetry." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by Peter E. Knox, 219–35. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Littlewood, R. Joy. 2006. *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book VI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livrea, Enrico. 1973. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon liber IV*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, and Peter Parsons. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Loewenstein, Joseph. 1984. *Responsive Readings: Versions of Echo in Pastoral, Epic, and the Jonsonian Masque*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Luck, Georg. 1977. *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia*. Vol. 2, *Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Lueneburg, Albert. 1888. *De Ovidio sui imitatore*. Jena: H. Pohle.
- Lundström, Sven. 1980. *Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1978. *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack, Sara. 1988. *Ovid*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mackie, Nicola. 1992. "Ovid and the Birth of *Maestas*." In *Roman Poetry & Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by Anton Powell, 83–97. London: Bristol Classical Press.

- Malamud, Martha A., and Donald T. McGuire. 1993. "Flavian Variant, Myth: Valerius' *Argonautica*." In *Roman Epic*, edited by Anthony J. Boyle, 192–217. London: Routledge.
- Marks, Raymond. 2010. "Silius and Lucan." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 127–53. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014. "Statio-Silian Relations in the *Thebaid* and *Punica* 1–2." *CP* 109:12–21.
- Martelli, Francesca. 2013. *Ovid's Revisions: The Editor as Author*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Massimilla, Giulio. 1996. *Callimaco, Aitia, libri primo e secondo*. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra.
- McAuley, Mairéad. 2012. "Matermorphoses: Motherhood and the Ovidian Epic Subject." *EuGeStA* 2:123–68.
- McGowan, Matthew. 2009. *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*. Leiden: Brill.
- McKeown, Jim. 1981. Review of Lundström 1980. *CR* 31:292–3.
- , ed. 1989. *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary*. Vol. 2, *A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- McNelis, Charles. 2002. "Greek Grammarians and Roman Society during the Early Empire: Statius' Father and His Contemporaries." *CA* 21:67–94.
- . 2007. *Statius' Thebaid and the Poetics of Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michalopoulos, Andreas. 2001. *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- Miles, Gary B. 1995. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Millar, Fergus. 1993. "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *JRS* 83:1–17.
- Miller, F. J., and G. P. Goold, trans. 1977. *Ovid: Metamorphoses*. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, John F. 2014. "'Connecting the Disconnected': The Kalends of May in Ovid's *Fasti*." Paper presented at meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Waco, TX, April 5. Abstract: <http://www.camws.org/meeting/2014/abstracts/individual/o60.ConnectingDisconnected.pdf>.
- Miller, P. Allen. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. 1995. "Ring-Patterns and Ring-Composition: Some Observations on the Framing of Stories in Homer." *Helios* 22:23–35.
- Möller, Melanie. 2003. "Der staunende Achill: Eine poetologische Lektüre der Cygnus-Episode (Ov. *Met.* 12, 64–167)." *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 6:51–66.
- Mooney, George W. 1921. *The Alexandra of Lycophron*. London: G. Bell and Sons.

- Moretti, Franco. 2005. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. London: Verso.
- Morgan, Llewelyn. 2003. "Child's Play: Ovid and His Critics." *JRS* 93:66–91.
- . 2012. "Elegiac Meter: Opposites Attract." In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, edited by Barbara K. Gold, 204–18. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mossman, Judith. 1999. *Wild Justice: A Study of Euripides' Hecuba*. 2nd ed. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Most, Glenn W. 1992. "*Disiecti membra poetae*: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry." In *Innovations of Antiquity*, edited by Ralph Hexter and Daniel Selden, 391–419. New York: Routledge.
- Mozley, J. H. 1963–64. "Virgil and the Silver Latin Epic." *PVS* 3:12–26.
- Munari, Franco. 1957. *Catalogue of the Mss of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. *BICS*, Supplement 4.
- Murray, A. T., and William F. Wyatt, trans. 1999. *Homer: Iliad*. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Musgrove, Margaret W. 1998. "Nestor's Centauromachy and the Deceptive Voice of Poetic Memory (Ovid *Met.* 12.182–535)." *CP* 93:223–31.
- Myers, K. Sara. 1994a. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1994b. "*Ultimus Ardor*: Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Met.* 14.623–771." *CJ* 89:225–50.
- . 1999. "The Metamorphosis of a Poet: Recent Work on Ovid." *JRS* 89:190–204.
- . 2009. *Ovid, Metamorphoses, Book XIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1958. *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1990. *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nagle, Betty Rose. 1988. "A Trio of Love Triangles in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 21:75–98.
- Natoli, Bartolo A. 2014. "Speech, Community, and the Formation of Memory in the Ovidian Exilic Corpus." PhD diss., University of Texas, Austin.
- Néraudau, Jean-Pierre. 1981. "La métamorphose d' Hécube." *BAGB* 1:35–51.
- Newlands, Carole E. 1991. "Ovid's Ravenous Raven." *CJ* 86:244–55.
- . 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 85. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 1997. "The Metamorphosis of Ovid's Medea." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, edited by James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston, 178–208. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2000. "Connecting the Disconnected: Reading Ovid's *Fasti*." In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, edited by Alison Sharrock and Helen Morales, 171–202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- . 2004. "Statius and Ovid: Transforming the Landscape." *TAPA* 134:133–55.
- Newman, John Kevin. 1986. *The Classical Epic Tradition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Newton, Rick M. 1987. "Odysseus and Hephaestus in the *Odyssey*." *CJ* 83:12–20.
- Nicoll, W. S. M. 1980. "Cupid, Apollo and Daphne (Ovid, *Met.* 1.452ff.)." *CQ* 30: 174–82.
- Nouvet, Claire. 1991. "An Impossible Response: The Disaster of Narcissus." *YFS* 79: 103–34.
- O'Hara, James J. 1994. "They Might Be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil's War in Italy." *Colby Quarterly* 30:206–32.
- Oliensis, Ellen. 2004. "The Power of Image-Makers: Representation and Revenge in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6 and *Tristia* 4." *CA* 23:285–321.
- Olson, S. Douglas. 1989. "Odyssey 8: Guile, Force, and the Subversive Poetics of Desire." *Arethusa* 22:135–45.
- . 2012. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Otis, Brooks. 1966. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Owen, S. G. 1915. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Libri Quinque, Ibis, ex Ponto Libri Quattuor, Halieutica, Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pache, Corinne O. 2004. *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Pandey, Nandini. 2013. "Caesar's Comet, the Julian Star, and the Invention of Augustus." *TAPA* 143:405–49.
- Pantelia, Maria C. 1993. "Spinning and Weaving: Ideas of Domestic Order in Homer." *AJP* 114:493–501.
- Papaioannou, Sophia. 2005. *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623–14.582, and the Reinvention of the Aeneid*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2006. "[O]pus est . . . Apolline nato: Liminality and Closure in the Aesculapius Episode in *Metamorphoses* 15.626–744." *C&M* 57:125–56.
- . 2007. *Redesigning Achilles: "Recycling" the Epic Cycle in the "Little Iliad" (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Parkes, Ruth. 2008. "The Return of the Seven: Allusion to the *Thebaid* in Statius' *Achilleid*." *AJP* 129:381–402.
- . 2013. "Chthonic Ingredients and Thematic Concerns: The Shaping of the Necromancy in the *Thebaid*." In *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 165–80. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parry, Hugh. 1964. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape." *TAPA* 95:268–82.
- Paschalis, Michael. 2003. "Names, Semantics, and Narrative in Ovid's Polydorus and Polyxena Episodes and their Intertexts (Euripides' *Hecuba* and Virgil's *Aeneid*)." *SIFC* 4:142–59.

- Pavlock, Barbara. 2009. *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Pease, A. S. 1935. *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peirano, Irene. 2012. *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pelliccia, Hayden. 2010. "Unlocking *Aeneid* 6.460: Plautus' *Amphitryon*, Euripides' *Protesilaus* and the Referents of Callimachus' *Coma*." *CJ* 106:149–219.
- Pellizer, Ezio. 1988. "Reflections, Echoes and Amorous Reciprocity: On Reading the Narcissus Story." In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, edited by Jan Bremmer, 107–20. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble.
- Petersen, Olaf, and Hans Weiss. 1985. "Ovids Einsatz mythologischer Stoffe: Ein Vergleich ausgewählter Mythen in den *Metamorphosen* und der *Ars amatoria*." *AU* 28:42–51.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. 1949. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Platnauer, Maurice. 1922. *Claudian*. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pohlenz, Mauriz. 1913. "Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids *Metamorphosen*." *Hermes* 48:1–13.
- Poortvliet, Harm M. 1991. *C. Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica Book II*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Porte, Danielle. 1983. "La fleur d'Olène et la naissance du dieu Mars." *Latomus* 42: 877–84.
- Poulsen, Brite. 1991. "The Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology." *SO* 66:119–46.
- Powell, J. G. F. 1999. "Stylistic Registers in Juvenal." In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, edited by James N. Adams and Roland G. Mayer, 311–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Purves, Alex. 2006. "Falling into Time in Homer's *Iliad*." *CA* 25:179–209.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 2001. "Ovid, Virgil and Myrrha's Metamorphic Exile." *Vergilius* 47:171–93.
- Quint, David. 2004. "Fear of Falling: Icarus, Phaethon, and Lucretius in *Paradise Lost*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 57:847–81.
- Raval, Shilpa. 2003. "Stealing the Language: Echo in *Metamorphoses* 3." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Phillip Thibodeau and Harry Haskell, 204–21. Afton, MN: Afton Historical Society Press.
- Rebenich, Stefan. 2009. "*Medio tutissimus ibis*: Mythos und Politik im frühen Prinzipat." In *Phaethon: Ein Mythos in Antike und Moderne*, edited by Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp and Stefan Rebenich, 33–44. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Reed, Joseph D. 2013. *Ovidio, Metamorfosi*. Vol. 5, *Libri X–XII*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.

- Reeve, Michael D. 1973. "Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*." *CQ* 23:334–37.
- Ribbeck, Otto. 1871. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta. Volumen I: Tragicorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Richardson, Nicholas. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1993. *The Iliad, a Commentary*. Vol. 6, Books 21–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, Aphrodite*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richlin, Amy. 1992. "Reading Ovid's Rapes." In *Pornography and Representation in the Ancient World*, edited by Amy Richlin, 158–79. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richmond, John. 2002. "Manuscript Traditions and the Transmission of Ovid's Works." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, 443–83. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rimell, Victoria. 2006. *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rinon, Yoav. 2006. "Mise en abyme and Tragic Signification in the *Odyssey*: The Three Songs of Demodocus." *Mnemosyne* 59:208–25.
- Ripoll, François. 1998. *La morale héroïque dans les épopées latines d'époque flavienne: Tradition et innovation*. Louvain: Peeters.
- . 2015. "Statius and Silius Italicus." In *Brill's Companion to Statius*, edited by William J. Dominik, Kyle Gervais, and Carole E. Newlands, 425–43. Leiden: Brill.
- Roberts, Michael. 1989. *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Robinson, Matthew. 1999. "Salmacis and Hermaphroditus: When Two Become One (Ovid, *Met.* 4.285–388)." *CQ* 49:212–23.
- Roche, Paul. 2009. *Lucan De Bello Civili, Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosati, Gianpiero. 1983. *Narcisso e Pigmalione: Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio*. Florence: Sansoni.
- . 1992. "L'*Achilleide* di Stazio, un'epica dell'ambiguità." *Maia* 44:233–66.
- . 1999. "Form in Motion: Weaving the Text in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and Its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen E. Hinds, 240–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, 271–304. Brill: Leiden.
- . 2004. "La strategia del ragno, ovvero la rivincita di Aracne: Fortuna tardoantica (Sidonio Apollinare, Claudiano) di un mito ovidiano." *Dictynna* 1:205–24.
- Rosen, Ralph M. 2003. "Revisiting Sophocles' *Poimenes*: Tragedy or Satyr Play?" In *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*, edited by Alan H. Sommerstein, 373–86. Bari: Levante Editori.

- Ross, D. O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rozée, Patricia. 1993. "Forbidden or Forgiven? Rape in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 17:499–514.
- Scheer, Eduard. 1958. *Lycophronis Alexandra*. Vol. 2, *Scholia*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Schiesaro, Alessandro. 2014. "Materiam superabat opus: Lucretius Metamorphosed." *JRS* 104:73–104.
- Schmitz, Christine. 2004. "Das Orpheus-Thema in Claudians *De Raptu Proserpinae*." In *Aetas Claudiana*, edited by Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers, Fritz Felgentreu, and Stephen Wheeler, 38–56. Munich: K. Saur.
- Schmitzer, Ulrich. 1990. *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen: Mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Scodel, Ruth. 1998. "The Captive's Dilemma: Sexual Acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*." *HSCP* 98:137–54.
- Scott, Kenneth. 1930. "Emperor Worship in Ovid." *TAPA* 61:43–69.
- Segal, Charles. 1969. *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- . 1998. "Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the *Metamorphoses*." *Arion* 5:9–41.
- . 2001. "Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Arion* 9:78–99.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1956. *Propertiana*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2003. *Statius*. Vol. 2, *Thebaid*, Books 8–12, *Achilleid*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sharrock, Alison. 1994a. "Ovid and the Politics of Reading." *MD* 33:97–122.
- . 1994b. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria* 2. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2000. "Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory." In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, edited by Alison Sharrock and Helen Morales, 1–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002a. "Gender and Sexuality." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 95–107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002b. "Ovid and the Discourses of Love: The Amatory Works." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 150–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skempis, Marios, and Ioannis Ziogas, eds. 2014. *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Aspects of Space and Its Representation in Greek and Roman Epic*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Slaney, H. 2014. "The Voyage of Rediscovery: Consuming Global Space in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." In *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Aspects of Space and Its Representation in Greek and Roman Epic*, edited by Marios Skempis and Ioannis Ziogas, 427–61. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Slatkin, Laura M. 1992. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Smith, R. Alden. 1997. *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Vergil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Snyder, Jane M. 1981. "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets." *CJ* 76:193–96.
- Solodow, Joseph. 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sommerstein, Alan H., and Thomas Talboy. 2012. *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Aris and Phillips.
- Spaltenstein, François. 1986. *Commentaire des Punica de Silius Italicus (livres 1 à 8)*. Geneva: Droz.
- . 2002. *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valérius Flaccus, livres 1–2*. Brussels: Latomus.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. "Echo." *NewLitHist* 24:17–43.
- Stirrup, Barbara E. 1976. "Ovid's Narrative Technique: A Study in Duality." *Latomus* 35:97–107.
- Stroh, Wilfried. 1979. "Ovids Liebeskunst und die Ehegesetze des Augustus." *Gymnasium* 86:323–52.
- Sumner, G. V. 1967. "Germanicus and Drusus Caesar." *Latomus* 26:413–35.
- Syed, Yasmin. 2004. "Ovid's Use of the Hymnic Genre in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Rituals in Ink*, edited by Alessandro Barchiesi, Jorg Rüpke, and Susan Stephens, 99–113. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Tarrant, Richard J. 1989. "The Reader as Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry." In *Editing Greek and Latin Texts: Papers Given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6–7 November 1987*, edited by John N. Grant, 121–62. New York: AMS Press.
- . 2002. "Ovid and Ancient Literary History." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 13–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012. *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Lily R. 1931. *Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Philological Monographs 1. Middletown, CT: American Philological Association.
- Thakur, Sanjaya. 2014. "Challenges in Teaching Sexual Violence and Rape: A Male Perspective." In *From Abortion to Pederasty: Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*, edited by Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Fiona McHardy, 152–70. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Thomas, Richard F. 1983. "Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces." *HSCP* 87:175–84.
- . 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *HSCP* 90:171–98.
- . 1988. *Virgil: Georgics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "Ovid and Ancient Literary History." In *Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 13–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tissol, Garth. 1993. "Ovid's Little *Aeneid* and the Thematic Integrity of the *Metamorphoses*." *Helios* 20:69–79.
- . 1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2002. "The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11–15." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, 305–35. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014. *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tissol, Garth, and Stephen Wheeler, eds. 2002. Special issue: "The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity." *Arethusa* 35.
- Tracy, Stephen V. 1997. "The Structures of the *Odyssey*." In *A New Companion to Homer*, edited by Ian Morris and Barry Powell, 360–79. Leiden: Brill.
- Tsai, S.-C. Kevin. 2007. "Hellish Love: Genre in Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae*." *Helios* 34:37–68.
- Uccellini, Renée. 2012. *L'arrivo di Achille a Sciro: Saggio di commento a Stazio Achilleide, 1.1–396*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale.
- Uden, James. 2011. "A Song from the Universal Chorus: The Perseus and Andromeda Epyllion." In *Forgotten Stars: Rediscovering Manilius' Astronomica*, edited by Stephen J. Green and Katharina Volk, 235–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Venini, P. 1952. "L'Hecuba di Euripide e Ovidio (*Met.* XIII 429–575)." *RIL* 85:364–77.
- Vergados, Athanassios. 2007. "A Commentary on the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*." PhD diss., University of Virginia.
- Vessey, D. W. T. C. 1973. *Statius and the Thebaid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vian, Francis. 1952. *La guerre des géants: Le mythe avant l'époque hellénistique*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Viansino, Giovanni. 1995. *La guerra civile*. Milan: A. Mondadori.
- Videau, Anne. 2010. *La poésie d'Ovide, de l'élegie à l'épopée des Métamorphoses*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Vinge, Louise. 1967. *The Narcissus Theme in Western European Literature up to the Early 19th Century*. Lund: Gleerups.
- Volk, Katharina. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. *Manilius and His Intellectual Background*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- von Albrecht, Michael. 1982. "Venus in Ovid's *Metamorphosen*." *Vichiana* 11:318–31.
- . 1989. "Proserpina's Tapestry in Claudian's *De Raptu*: Tradition and Design." *ICS* 14:383–90.
- von Glinski, Marie Louise. 2012. *Simile and Identity in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ware, Catherine. 2011. "Proserpina and the Martyrs: Pagan and Christian in Late Antiquity." In *Listen O Isles unto Me: Studies in Medieval Word and Image in Honour of Jennifer O'Reilly*, edited by Elizabeth Mullins and Diarmuid Scully, 16–27. Cork: Cork University Press.
- . 2012. *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, David, trans. 1990. *Virgil: The Aeneid*. London: Penguin.
- West, Martin L. 1966. *Theogony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- . 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. "'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle?" *JHS* 122:109–33.
- Wheeler, Stephen M. 1995. "Imago Mundi: Another View of the Creation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *AJP* 116:95–121.
- . 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2000. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- . 2002a. "Introduction: Toward a Literary History of Ovid's Reception in Antiquity." *Arethusa* 35:341–47.
- . 2002b. "Lucan's Reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 35:361–80.
- . 2004–5. "Before the *Aetas Ovidiana*: The Early Reception of Ovid." *Hermathena* 177–78:5–26.
- . 2009. "Into New Bodies: The Incipit of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as Intertext in Imperial Latin Literature." In *Callida Musa: Papers on Latin Literature in Honor of R. Elaine Fantham*, edited by Rolando Ferri, Mira Seo, and Katharina Volk, 123–36. MD 61.
- Wieseler, Friedrich. 1854. *Die Nympe Echo: Eine kunstmythologische Abhandlung*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- . 1856. *Narkissos: Eine kunstmythologische Abhandlung nebst einem Anhang über den Narcissen und ihre Beziehung im Leben, Mythos und Cultus der Griechen*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Willcock, Malcolm M. 1995. *Pindar, Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7 and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4 and 7*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Gareth D. 1994. *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "Ovid's Exilic Poetry: Worlds Apart." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, 337–81. Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, Gordon. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wills, Jeffrey. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wilson, Marcus. 2004. "Ovidian Silius." *Arethusa* 37:225–49.
- Wise, Valerie M. 1977. "Flight Myths in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: An Interpretation of Phaethon and Daedalus." *Ramus* 6:44–59.

- Wiseman, Peter. 1999. "The Games of Flora." In *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, edited by Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon, 194–203. Studies in the History of Art 56. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art.
- . 2002. "Ovid and the Stage." In *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at Its Bimillennium*, edited by Geraldine Herbert-Brown, 275–99. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wray, David. 2002. "Astrology in Ancient Rome: Poetry, Prophecy and Power." <http://fathom.lib.uchicago.edu/1/777777122543/>.
- Wyke, Maria. 2006. "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1." In *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Ovid*, edited by Peter E. Knox, 169–204. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Previously published (1989) in *History as Text*, edited by Averill Cameron, 111–43. London: Duckworth.
- Yasumura, Norika. 2011. *Challenges to the Power of Zeus in Early Greek Poetry*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by H. Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zeitlin, Froma I. 1990. "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, edited by John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin, 130–67. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ziogas, Ioannis. 2008. Review of Papaioannou 2007. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 10.33.
- . 2013. *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2014. "The Topography of Epic Narrative in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Aspects of Space and Its Representation in Greek and Roman Epic*, edited by Marios Skempis and Ioannis Ziogas, 325–48. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Zissos, Andrew. 2002. "Reading Models and the Homeric Program in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *Helios* 29:69–96.
- . 2008. *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zumwalt, Nancy. 1977. "Fama Subversa: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12." *CSCA* 10:209–22.

Contributors

ANTHONY AUGOUSTAKIS is a professor of classics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is the author of books and articles on various Latin authors, including *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic* (2010) and *Statius, Thebaid 8* (2016). He has edited the *Brill Companion to Silius Italicus* (2010), *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic* (2013), *Flavian Poetry and Its Greek Past* (2014), *The Blackwell Companion to Terence* (2013), and *Oxford Readings in Flavian Epic* (2016).

NEIL W. BERNSTEIN is a professor in the Department of Classics and World Religions at Ohio University, where he teaches Latin language and literature. He is the author of *Silius Italicus, Punica 2: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (forthcoming); *Ethics, Identity, and Community in Later Roman Declamation* (2013); and *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic* (2008).

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD is the Henry Winkley Professor of Latin and Greek at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine. She is the author of *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores* (1997) and editor of *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (2002) and (with Cora Fox) *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Ovid and the Ovidian Tradition* (2010). Her current projects include a book on Ovid's reception of the Homeric poems and a commentary on Ovid's *Remedia amoris*.

ANDREW FELDHER is a professor of classics at Princeton University. He is the author of *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (1998) and *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction* (2010) as well as articles on Vergil, Catullus, and Roman historiography. His current project, "After the

Past: Sallust on History and Writing History,” treats the relationship between reading, writing, and political action in the aftermath of civil war.

LAUREL FULKERSON is a professor of classics at Florida State University, as well as an associate dean in the College of Arts and Sciences. Her research is split between Latin poetry and the study of the emotions in antiquity, and she is author of *The Ovidian Heroine as Author* (2005) and *No Regrets: Remorse in Classical Antiquity* (2013), as well as the introductory book *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins* (2016).

PETER HESLIN is a reader in classics at Durham University. He is the author of *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid* (2005) and *The Museum of Augustus: The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome and Latin Poetry* (2015), and he is currently finishing a book about Greek myth in Propertius. He has written articles on the poetry and topography of Augustan Rome and on the Latin epic tradition. He is also the developer of *Diogenes*, open-source software for classicists.

STEPHEN HINDS is a professor of classics and the former Byron W. and Alice L. Lockwood Professor of the Humanities at the University of Washington, Seattle. He is the author of *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (1987) and *Allusion and Intertext* (1998); many of his articles focus on Ovid and the Ovidian tradition. With Denis Feeney, he cofounded and coedited the book series *Roman Literature and Its Contexts*, with fourteen volumes published between 1993 and 2016. A project in progress, with the working title “Poetry across Languages,” explores the cross-linguistic and intercultural relations of Latin literature, both in antiquity and between antiquity and (early) modernity. More longstanding commitments include a commentary on Ovid, *Tristia* 1.

SHARON L. JAMES is a professor of classics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her specialties are women and gender in antiquity, Roman poetry, and New Comedy, in which fields she has published many articles. Her first book, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion* (2003), studied Roman love elegy from the viewpoint of its love object, the *docta puella*. She coedited *A Companion to Women in Antiquity* (2012) and *Women in Republican Roman Drama* (2015), and is coediting a four-volume set of reprinted essays: *Women in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. She is currently preparing *Women in New Comedy* for publication and organizing a series of Greek and Roman comedies in translation for the University of Wisconsin Press.

ALISON KEITH has taught classics and women's studies at the University of Toronto since 1988. Her research focuses on the intersection of gender and genre in Latin literature: she has written books on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Latin epic, and Propertius, and edited volumes on the reception of the *Metamorphoses*, the cultural politics of Roman dress, and Latin elegy and Hellenistic epigram. She is currently completing a book on Vergil for the series Understanding Classics. Ongoing projects include a commentary on *Metamorphoses* book 4 and a monograph on the reception of the *Metamorphoses* in Flavian epic.

PETER E. KNOX is the Eric and Jane Nord Family Professor and Director of the Baker-Nord Center for the Humanities at Case Western Reserve University. He has published articles and reviews on a wide range of subjects in Hellenistic poetry and Latin literature of the late Republic and early empire. His books include *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (1986); *Ovid, Heroides: Select Epistles* (1995); *Oxford Readings in Ovid* (2006); *A Companion to Ovid* (2009); and *The Oxford Anthology of Roman Literature* (2013), coedited with J. C. McKeown. An edition of the Greek and Latin poetry of Angelo Poliziano is forthcoming in the I Tatti Renaissance Library, and he is preparing a new edition of the *Metamorphoses* for the Loeb Classical Library.

DARCY KRASNE is a visiting assistant professor of classics at the University of Missouri–Columbia. Her research primarily revolves around the use of mythology in Latin poetry, with side interests in cosmography, civil war, onomastics, and puns. The author of a number of articles on Ovid's *Ibis* and Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica*, she is currently writing a monograph on the *Argonautica*.

TIM STOVER is an associate professor of classics at Florida State University. He specializes in Latin literature, with a particular interest in epic poetry. In addition to articles on Lucretius, Vergil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, and Statius, he is the author of *Epic and Empire in Vespasianic Rome: A New Reading of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica* (2012). His current long-term project is a book on the influence of the *Argonautica* on subsequent Flavian epic.

Index

- Achilles, 16–17, 30, 69–99, 102, 106, 120, 132, 136–38, 197, 217
- Agenor, 81–88
- Alexandrian footnote, 54, 60–61, 192n5
- allusion, 5–6, 23n16, 47–48, 68n43, 196, 225–26, 231
- Althaea and Meleager, 20, 179–81
- Andromache, 107
- Arachne's tapestry, 33, 58, 78, 155–62, 169, 256
- Ares, 140. *See also* Homer, *Odyssey*
- Aristaeus, 64
- Asteropaeus, 81–85
- Augustus, 18–19, 27, 126–27, 135–42, 170, 178, 184–90. *See also* Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
- authority, 15, 17, 28, 33, 77, 96
- bi-directional influence, 231–32
- Caenis/Caeneus, 78, 81, 155, 158
- Capella, 135–36
- Capricorn, 135–36
- Chaos, 30, 32, 64–65, 125, 128, 134, 217
- Claudian, *De raptu Proserpinae*: Erysichthon, 267; Hyacinthus, 261–63, 266; Narcissus, 261–62, 266; Orpheus, 254–55, 263; Proserpina, 22, 255–61, 266, 268–70; Venus, 262, 269–70
- Claudian, image problem of, 22, 250, 257
- collocations, 225–26, 229, 240–41
- cornucopia, 135–136. *See also* Ovid, *Fasti*
- cosmogony, 18, 126–35, 143, 217
- Deidamia, 89. *See also* Statius, *Achilleid*
- ecphrasis, 15, 22, 28–35, 41–42, 58, 61, 86, 198–99, 202, 220, 256, 265, 268
- elegy, 55, 67n28; and epic, 53–54, 125, 214, 252–53
- epic, 6–7, 15, 27, 34, 69–78, 87–89, 92, 100–101, 120–121, 128, 251–252; and elegy, 53–54, 125, 214, 252–253; and tragedy, 17, 101
- etiology, 156, 164, 177, 211–213, 214
- fama*, 34, 59, 126, 215
- Fama, 23n12, 39, 85. *See also* Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
- Hecuba, 103–5. *See also* Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
- Hephaestus, 134. *See also* Homer, *Odyssey*
- Hesiod, 65, 126, 128–30, 133

- Homer, *Iliad*, 6–7, 16–17, 69–99;
 Achilles's shield, 30, 33; Thetis, 86
- Homer, *Odyssey*, 6–7; Aphrodite, Ares,
 and Hephaestus, 16, 47–68; Nausicaa,
 201
- intertextuality, 3, 5–6, 19, 21, 23n16,
 177–78, 196, 214, 225
- invulnerability, 17, 70, 78–81, 85–88,
 93–96
- Love maior/Love maius*, 18, 132, 138, 140–41
- Janus, 125, 144n7
- locus amoenus*, 199, 201, 256–58, 263, 265,
 269
- locus horridus*, 257, 263, 265
- Lucan, *Bellum Civile*, 88, 197, 227–28,
 230–33, 240–41, 250, 266; Medusa,
 214–15; Roma, 253
- Lucretia, 19, 159, 164–65. *See also* Ovid,
Fasti
- Lucretius, 45n18, 45n28, 46n29, 66n14,
 120, 227, 229–31, 235, 241
- Maiestas, 126–29
- Manilius, *Astronomica*, 196–97, 199, 214,
 227–30, 233
- Mars, 86, 135, 140, 156, 164; birth of, 127,
 134, 140–42; temple of Mars Ultor,
 127, 141–42. *See also* Ovid, *Ars*
amatoria
- May, etymologies of, 130
- Menoetes, 82–84
- Muses, 70, 73, 85, 128, 130, 156, 176; quarrel
 of, 126–27. *See also* Polyhymnia
- Orion, 142–43. *See also* Ovid, *Fasti*
- Ovid, *Ars amatoria*, 176–78, 217; Mars,
 Venus, and Vulcan, 52–65; Sabine
 women, 165; Venus, 177
- Ovid, *Fasti*, 18, 22, 125–43, 154, 165,
 178, 196–97, 217, 249, 253, 262, 264,
 270–71; cornucopia, 127, 136;
 Dolphin, 217; Flora, 127; 134, 155,
 166–67; Lucretia, 165–67; Mars,
 164; Orion, 127, 142; rape victims in,
 166–67; repetition in, 18; Romulus,
 127, 129–30, 138–40; Titanomachy,
 133–35
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*: Actaeon, 181,
 183–84, 207; Althaea, 179–81; Augus-
 tus, 18, 184–88, 198; Cadmus, 204–5;
 Cycnus, 69–73, 77–88, 93–94;
 Daedalus, 219; Daphne, 60, 155–57,
 159–60, 168; Echo and Narcissus,
 8–15; Erysichthon, 215; Fama, 70, 73,
 75–76, 78, 85, 136, 139; Hecuba, 17–18,
 100–124; Hermaphroditus and
 Salmacis, 14; Medusa, 211–12;
 Minyeides, 57–63; Nestor, 73–81,
 87–88; Orpheus, 217, 220; patterns
 of rape in, 18–19, 156–59, 169–70;
 Perseus, 199–200, 210–11; Phaethon,
 15–16, 26–43, 132; Polymestor, 100,
 102, 106, 108, 111–13, 115–16, 118;
 Proserpina, 157–58, 199, 202–3;
 Scorpio, 37; *sphragis*, 126; Thetis,
 132–33, 137, 158; Tiresias, 206
- Ovidianism, 88–96, 250, 252–56, 262–63,
 267
- Perillus, 176–77, 181
- Phaethon, 184–86, 191. *See also* Ovid,
Metamorphoses
- Plato, 29
- Polyhymnia, 126–31, 133
- Polymestor, 102–3, 105. *See also* Ovid,
Metamorphoses
- Proserpina, 47, 196, 201–2. *See also* Clau-
 dian, *De raptu Proserpinae*; Ovid,
Metamorphoses

- rape, 26, 32, 127, 154–70; of daughters, 157, 159, 166; and the foundation of Rome, 156, 163, 168–69; in Livy, 167–68; patterns of, in the *Fasti*, 166–67; patterns of, in the *Metamorphoses*, 18–19, 156–59, 169–70; of wives, 167–68
- refoundation, 19
- repetition: avoidance of, 19, 47; epic, 6–7; modern theories of, 4–6; Ovidian, 8–15, 47–48, 69–70, 64–65, 100–101, 116–21, 176–79, 196–97; and rape, 163–67; in ritual lamentation, 108–9; tragic, 101
- representation, 9, 13–14, 15, 28–36, 42–43
- Rhea Silvia / Ilia, 165–67; absence of rape narrative in the *Metamorphoses*, 19, 164
- Romulus, 140–41, 164, 167, 170. *See also* Ovid, *Fasti*
- Sabine women, 19, 158, 164–67
- Saguntum, 235. *See also* Silius Italicus, *Punica*
- Scorpio, 142. *See also* Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
- Scyros, 81, 89–93
- servitium amoris*, 56
- sidus Iulium*, 153n79
- Silius Italicus, *Punica*, 20–21, 214–15, 225–46; Daedalus, 218–19; Hannibal, 21, 215–16, 218, 240–41, 247n4; Orpheus, 217; Saguntum, 232; Teuthras, 216–17
- Spaltenstein, François, 234–38, 242, 244
- sphragis*, 127, 135. *See also* Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
- statistical analysis, 229–30
- Statius, *Achilleid*, 228, 230–33, 249; Achilles's invulnerability, 79; Deidamia, 90–92; Ovidian nature of, 88–96; Thetis, 94–95
- Statius, *Thebaid*, 20–21, 88, 92, 203–4, 228, 230–33, 235; Adrastus, 209–14; “Cadmean paradigm” in, 21, 204–5, 211; Furies, 213; Jupiter, 206; Oedipus, 205–6; Polynices, 207–9, 211; Tydeus, 209, 211
- Styx, 17, 79, 81, 84, 93–96, 129
- succession, 15, 43n2, 125–43; in Augustan Rome, 18, 126, 135, 137–38, 140–43; heirs of Augustus, 140–43
- Succession Myth, 18–19, 126, 129–43
- superiority, of sons over fathers, 130, 137, 140
- Tesserae* project, 21–22, 226–28, 231–32, 234–35, 238–39, 241–42, 244, 246
- Themis as Carmentis/Carmentis as Themis, 145n17
- Thetis, 79, 81, 84, 93, 129–30. *See also* Homer, *Iliad*; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*; Statius, *Achilleid*; Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*
- Tiberius, 140–43
- Titanomachy, 132, 136. *See also* Ovid, *Fasti*
- Tlepolemus, 75–76, 88
- tragedy, 13, 40, 71–72, 101, 113, 198; and epic, 17, 101
- Typhoeus, 129–30, 134, 142
- Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, 20, 197, 228, 230, 232–33; Argo, 20, 198–99; Hesione, 199; Hercules, 199–200; Jason, 199; Medea, 201–3; Thetis, 221n10
- Verginia, 19, 156, 159, 164–65, 168–69

- Virgil, *Aeneid*, 5–6, 17–18, 21, 91, 100, 102, 118, 121, 130, 181, 196–97, 214, 229–31, 241, 252; Aeneas, 110; Andromache, 107; Dardanus, 216; Dido, 209; ending of, 116–17; Evander, 209; Fama, 73; Hecuba, 104–5; Hercules and Cacus, 211; Iopas, 217; Priam, 104–5; Thrace, 117; Turnus, 119
- Wilson, Marcus, 225–26, 232
- wordplay, 27, 34–35, 152n72, 193n20, 196

Index Locorum

Aeschylus

Cho.

168–230, 123n17

PV

920–25, 130

Apollodorus

Bibl.

1.4.3, 152n75

3.2.2, 150n55

Epit.

2.1–12, 97n4

3.29–31, 70

Apollonius Rhodius

1.762–63, 152n75

4.1513–17, 223n30

Apuleius

Met.

4.33.5–8, 147n28

Aratus

Phaen.

1, 145n13

Aristotle

Rh.

1396b, 70

Athenaeus

9.393e, 97n10

Aulus Gellius

2.23, 122n11

11.4, 122n11

Ausonius

Epist.

13.49, 275n29

Mos.

278, 248n16

284, 247n16

287, 247n16

Baebius Italicus

Il. Lat.

371, 248n16

Caesar

B Gall.

5.29.7, 248n23

Callimachus

Aet.

Fr. 28–34 *M*, 209

Hymn

3.145, 222n14

4.141–47, 148n38

6.8–9, 277n51

6.8–21, 277n51

6.17, 277n51

6.29–30, 264

6.30, 275n35

6.53, 267

Catullus

62.44, 24n21

64.2–3, 198

65.66, 5

- Catullus (*continued*)
 68.33–34, 192n12
 68.55–56, 248n24
- Cicero
Nat. D.
 2.84, 145n14
 3.30–31, 145n14
Verr.
 4.107, 259
 4.108, 260
 4.111, 275n34
- Claudian
DRP
 1.25–26, 277n53
 1.28–29, 278n58
 1.67, 253
 1.117, 253
 1.122, 257, 274n28, 274n29
 1.122–26, 259
 1.214, 277n54
 1.223–24, 277n54
 1.246–75, 274n23
 1.266–72, 255
 2 *praef.* 1–2, 254
 2 *praef.* 21–24, 273n20
 2 *praef.* 29–48, 273n20
 2 *praef.* 29, 273n20
 2 *praef.* 49–52, 254
 2 *praef.* 52, 274n22
 2.71–75, 258
 2.72, 274n28
 2.73–87, 258
 2.92–100, 261
 2.101, 276n46
 2.101–3, 259
 2.112, 277n57
 2.112–13, 258
 2.122–23, 262
 2.128–29, 261
 2.128–36, 261
 2.131–36, 261
 2.133–36, 262
 2.149, 274n22
 2.156–62, 276n41
 2.239, 274n22
 2.282–85, 263
 2.287–89, 263
 2.289, 274n28, 276n40
 2.290–93, 276n39
 3.69–70, 274n25
 3.85, 274n28, 277n52
 3.118–21, 268
 3.120, 277n53
 3.155, 274n25
 3.157, 274n25
 3.158, 256
 3.196–259, 273n14
 3.220, 274n28
 3.220–22, 260
 3.220–27, 269
 3.222, 270
 3.259, 273n14
 3.330–31, 265
 3.332, 265, 276n46
 3.332–56, 276n44
 3.334–37, 265
 3.337–47, 266
 3.344, 277n47
 3.353, 266
 3.357–59, 266
 3.358, 276n46, 277n50
 3.359, 277n50
 3.370, 277n48
 3.438, 271
 3.447–48, 271
- Gild.*
 28–127, 253
 139–200, 253
 201, 253
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus
Ant. Rom.
 1.31, 145n17

- Euripides
Hec.
 1169–71, 113
 1265–74, 103
Supp.
 846–56, 74
Hesiod
Cat.
 137a–c Most, 150n55
Theog.
 1, 128, 145n9
 11–21, 128
 36, 128
 39, 145n10
 44–50, 128
 60, 145n10
 104, 128
 105–13, 128
 114, 128
 383–403, 129
 837–38, 146n27
 897, 130
 898, 146n26
 927–29, 134
Homer
Il.
 1.266–72, 150n55
 1.404, 148n38
 2.461, 276n42
 4.127–219, 84
 4.364–410, 150n55
 4.400, 150n55
 4.405, 150n55
 9.185–89, 78
 9.312–13, 87
 9.667–68, 89
 9.668, 90
 11.252–68, 83
 11.435–45, 84
 11.576, 247n4
 14.166–86, 66n12
 18.483–84, 44n10
 19.326–27, 89
 21.166–67, 81
 21.167, 84
 21.568–70, 82, 98n22
 24.59–62, 93
 24.208–216, 102
Od.
 8.72–82, 49
 8.75, 66n7
 8.83–103, 49
 8.131–255, 49
 8.266–366, 49
 8.267, 50, 53
 8.268–70, 50
 8.268–71, 54
 8.270–75, 50
 8.276, 55
 8.276–81, 50
 8.280–81, 55
 8.282, 55
 8.282–99, 50
 8.286, 55
 8.297, 55
 8.300–320, 50
 8.305–21, 62
 8.309, 55
 8.315–20, 55
 8.317, 55
 8.318–19, 66n8, 67n25
 8.321–23, 55
 8.321–43, 50
 8.327, 55
 8.328, 67n27
 8.329, 57
 8.329–32, 55
 8.330–32, 66n8
 8.332, 51, 55
 8.334–43, 56
 8.344–56, 56
 8.344–66, 50

- Homer
Od. (continued)
 8.357–66, 56
 8.366, 56
 8.367–68, 49
 8.386–457, 49
 8.431–586, 49
 8.470–531, 49
- Horace
Carm.
 3.1.1, 189
Epist.
 2.1.75, 194n31
Sat.
 2.3.291, 248n25
- Hyginus
Fab.
 111, 122n8
 146, 275n29
Hym. Hom. Ap. 3
 305–52, 134
 328–30, 135
 334–36, 135
 339, 146n27
 343–48, 135
Hym. Hom. Aphro. 5
 58–63, 52
 58–68, 66n12
Hym. Hom. Dem. 2
 8, 275n38
 17, 274n26
- Livy
Praef 6–7, 28
 1.9.12, 175n43
 1.10, 167
 1.18, 167
 3.48, 168
- Lucan
 1.135, 277n47
 3.399–452, 276n47
 4.630, 244, 247n13
- 5.811, 248n20
 6.686, 248n16
 9.622–23, 215
 9.623, 214, 215
 9.624–83, 214
 9.684–99, 214
 9.700–733, 214
- Lucretius
 1.404–9, 120
 3.15, 44n8
 3.442, 231
 5.396–405, 46n29
 5.118, 46n30
- Lycophron
Alex.
 232, 98n25
 232–33, 97n5
 330–34, 114–15
 1181–84, 114–15
- Manilius
 1.270, 191n2
 4.547–52, 152n78
 5.449–85, 197
 5.504–630, 197
- Martial
 9.30.3, 107
- Milton
Paradise Lost
 4.268–75, 257, 264
 4.272–74, 276n43
- Nicander
Het.
F 62 Gow-Schofield, 104
- Ovid
Am.
 1.1.1–4, 53
 1.1.3–4, 67n22
 1.4.21, 67n20
 1.8.98, 67n20
 1.9.39–40, 65n3
 2.11.1–4, 198

- 2.11.10, 220n1
 2.17.19–20, 67n18
 2.18.21–34, 196
 2.18.24, 221n2
 2.19.11–14, 53
 3.1.9–12, 53
 3.1.60, 67n24
 3.6.13, 209
 3.10.27–28, 248n20
 3.12.19–22, 278n60
 3.12.37, 45n27
Ars am.
 1.7, 177
 1.11–12, 217
 1.225, 209
 1.313, 67n16
 1.331–32, 278n60
 1.405–36, 67n19
 1.653–56, 176
 1.656, 177
 2.24, 220n1
 2.128, 8
 2.497, 67n20
 2.561, 54, 60
 2.561–600, 52
 2.563, 53, 57
 2.563–64, 66n14
 2.564, 53
 2.565–66, 53
 2.567, 54
 2.567–68, 53, 54
 2.569–70, 53
 2.569–72, 54
 2.573–74, 54
 2.575, 55
 2.575–76, 54
 2.577, 55
 2.578, 55, 61
 2.579–80, 55
 2.580, 55
 2.581, 55, 56
 2.582–84, 56
 2.586, 56
 2.587, 56
 2.587–88, 56
 2.589–92, 57
Fast.
 1.103, 143n1
 1.235–36, 148n37
 2.27–38, 165
 2.79–118, 217
 2.127–44, 138–39
 2.132, 141
 2.243–66, 144n2
 2.461–64, 149n45
 2.795–802, 165
 3.1–22, 66n14
 3.207–12, 165
 3.795–808, 133
 3.796–98, 148n37
 4.31–32, 216
 4.61–84, 147n30
 4.197–200, 148n37
 4.197–214, 133
 4.417–18, 249, 272n4
 4.421–22, 275n34
 4.437–42, 275n36
 4.451, 274n22
 4.461–62, 271
 4.499–500, 271
 4.500, 271, 278n60, 278n61
 4.502–60, 199
 4.607, 248n25
 5.7–8, 128
 5.8, 215
 5.9, 128
 5.10, 128
 5.11, 128
 5.11–14, 128
 5.14, 145n15
 5.15–16, 128
 5.18, 128

Ovid

Fast. (continued)

5.22, 129
 5.27, 129
 5.34, 129, 148n37
 5.35-46, 129
 5.55, 147n28
 5.79-80, 147n28
 5.83, 130
 5.111, 128, 145n13
 5.111-58, 144n4
 5.113-28, 131
 5.116, 132
 5.125, 132
 5.125-26, 132, 148n37
 5.126, 132
 5.169, 134
 5.180, 134
 5.195-212, 148n42
 5.229, 149n47
 5.233, 135
 5.241-42, 135
 5.257-58, 135
 5.259-330, 149n49
 5.279-330, 148n42
 5.377, 135
 5.533, 152n75
 5.553-54, 141
 5.567-68, 141
 5.569-80, 141
 6.25-36, 166
 6.530, 248n23
 6.587-616, 174n33
 6.627-36, 174n33

Her.

12.123-24, 278n60

Ib.

435-38, 191n3

Met.

1.1-4, 73
 1.3-4, 154

1.5, 44n10
 1.7, 234n36
 1.10-11, 224n36
 1.11-12, 224n36
 1.17, 224n36
 1.21, 224n36
 1.22, 30
 1.22-23, 224n36
 1.23, 217
 1.34-35, 224n36
 1.43-44, 217
 1.57, 192n6
 1.73, 224n36
 1.80-81, 39
 1.113-14, 148n37
 1.113-15, 133
 1.157, 39
 1.174-75, 185
 1.295, 247n16
 1.312, 248n25
 1.393-94, 39
 1.452, 60
 1.456, 67n20
 1.488-89, 160
 1.545-52, 168
 1.547, 173n21
 1.751, 34
 1.753-54, 26, 34
 1.756, 26, 68n45
 1.764, 28
 1.769-70, 33
 1.770, 28
 1.771, 28
 1.779, 35
 2.1, 37
 2.5, 30
 2.5-7, 29
 2.15, 32
 2.19, 34
 2.20, 34
 2.23-24, 216

- 2.24–25, 33
 2.26, 35
 2.30–31, 36
 2.49–104, 223n33
 2.50–51, 26
 2.62, 132
 2.73, 41
 2.76–77, 46n29
 2.82, 37
 2.86, 37
 2.92, 46n30
 2.98–99, 46n30
 2.104, 29, 41
 2.145, 40
 2.182–84, 38
 2.190, 38
 2.195–200, 37
 2.327, 40
 2.329–30, 36
 2.329–31, 38
 2.331, 46n30
 2.333–34, 39
 2.336, 39
 2.338–39, 40
 2.356, 41
 2.357, 41
 2.365, 40
 2.377–80, 184
 2.409–632, 144n2
 2.424–38, 173n26
 2.445–48, 277n55
 2.572, 161
 2.767, 44n8
 2.824, 243, 247n13
 3.3–5, 205
 3.6–7, 204, 207
 3.31–49, 223n31
 3.35, 207
 3.129, 207
 3.131–37, 204
 3.138–39, 204
 3.138–42, 181
 3.141, 184
 3.146–47, 207
 3.203, 206
 3.333–35, 206
 3.353, 24n21
 3.357–58, 12
 3.361, 12
 3.366–68, 24n29
 3.379–92, 10
 3.399–510, 9
 3.454, 14
 3.491–501, 13
 3.501, 24n21
 4.1–12, 58
 4.32–35, 58
 4.43, 59
 4.44–50, 59
 4.53, 58, 59
 4.55–166, 58
 4.169–270, 58
 4.170, 60
 4.171, 2.20
 4.171–72, 60
 4.173–74, 61
 4.174–76, 61
 4.175, 62
 4.176–77, 61
 4.177, 61
 4.178–79, 61
 4.180–84, 62
 4.181, 62
 4.183, 62
 4.185, 62
 4.186, 62
 4.186–88, 62
 4.188, 62, 63
 4.188–89, 68n44
 4.189, 60
 4.204–8, 68n45
 4.218–320, 173n26

Ovid

Met. (continued)

- 4.233, 171n10
 4.238–39, 172n10
 4.263, 248n25
 4.276, 59
 4.276–388, 59
 4.281–83, 59
 4.284, 59
 4.285, 59
 4.296–97, 59
 4.340, 172n12
 4.391, 63
 4.391–93, 63
 4.394–98, 63
 4.564, 204
 4.564–67, 204
 4.567–68, 207
 4.572, 207
 4.576–79, 205
 4.606–11, 208
 4.607–11, 208–9
 4.612–20, 210
 4.621–23, 211
 4.627, 200
 4.644–45, 199
 4.668–88, 199
 4.674, 200
 4.675, 200
 4.678–81, 200
 4.685–88, 200
 4.695–739, 200
 4.699, 215
 4.703, 199, 200
 4.716–20, 223n30
 4.739, 172n12, 199
 4.757, 199, 200
 4.784–85, 211
 4.787, 199
 4.794–803, 211–12
 4.801, 212
 4.803, 212
 5.25, 199, 200
 5.134, 227, 247n7
 5.202, 215
 5.243, 199
 5.257, 215
 5.260, 147n28
 5.270, 145n10
 5.312, 207, 215
 5.318–31, 70
 5.321–31, 149n45
 5.337, 145n10
 5.338–39, 147n28
 5.346–58, 149n45
 5.363–84, 277n54
 5.369–72, 147n28
 5.375–77, 147n28
 5.436, 243, 247n13
 5.462–64, 278n58
 5.385, 202
 5.385–86, 258
 5.385–87, 264, 276n42
 5.385–95, 202, 278n57
 5.390, 202
 5.390–91, 276n40
 5.391, 202, 270
 5.391–93, 278n57
 5.392, 202, 277n56
 5.394, 202, 203
 5.395, 203
 5.561, 216
 5.642–61, 199
 6.73–74, 33
 6.103, 162
 6.103–26, 161–62
 6.113, 162
 6.118, 162
 6.124, 162
 6.125, 162
 6.131, 162
 6.301–9, 114

- 6.304–5, 240
 6.561–62, 172n14
 6.586, 117
 7.6, 198
 7.74–95, 201
 7.334, 243, 247n13
 7.357–404, 171n3
 7.443–47, 209
 7.697, 161
 7.702–4, 203
 8.6–151, 209
 8.120–21, 278n60
 8.200–202, 219
 8.201–2, 219
 8.217–20, 219
 8.227–30, 219
 8.304, 193n19
 8.310, 207
 8.434, 193n19
 8.446, 193n19
 8.463–64, 180
 8.473–78, 179
 8.478, 180
 8.506–8, 193n18
 8.751–52, 267
 8.754–57, 267
 8.757, 277n50
 8.805, 115
 8.820, 248n25
 8.831, 248n25
 9.13, 222n14
 9.51, 222n14
 9.85–92, 149n53
 9.110, 222n14
 9.217, 222n14
 9.332, 159
 10.90–108, 273n20
 11.1–2, 217, 273n20
 11.45, 217
 11.195, 247n16
 11.205–13, 199
 11.213, 222n14
 11.217–28, 132
 11.221–65, 221n10
 11.223, 137
 11.224, 132, 199
 11.240, 158, 174n31
 11.264, 173n18
 11.310, 173n26
 11.370, 248n25
 12.1–3, 108
 12.1–38, 70
 12.39–63, 70
 12.58, 75
 12.64–71, 70
 12.82–101, 82
 12.88–91, 86
 12.91–92, 86
 12.119–27, 82–83
 12.157–62, 98n19
 12.159–62, 77
 12.164–68, 87
 12.165, 79, 80
 12.165–71, 78–79
 12.169, 80
 12.170, 98n25
 12.175, 80
 12.175–79, 80
 12.182–84, 73
 12.210–535, 221n10
 12.366–92, 75
 12.426–28, 73
 12.459–61, 74
 12.461, 74
 12.504–6, 172n13
 12.538, 222n14
 12.540, 76
 12.541, 76
 12.575, 75
 12.591, 93
 13.162–70, 89, 92, 93
 13.175, 90

Ovid

Met. (continued)

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 13.299, 92 | 13.565–75, 114 |
| 13.392, 117 | 13.569–70, 115 |
| 13.404, 118 | 13.628, 117 |
| 13.404–7, 121n5 | 13.700, 153n81 |
| 13.408, 118 | 13.744–45, 171n6 |
| 13.420–21, 123n14 | 14.25–27, 65n3 |
| 13.422–28, 106 | 14.81, 196 |
| 13.423, 106 | 14.148, 235 |
| 13.430, 117 | 14.573, 118 |
| 13.458–59, 117 | 14.573–80, 119 |
| 13.484, 112 | 14.574, 119 |
| 13.487, 123n15 | 14.578–79, 118 |
| 13.488–93, 108 | 14.600–604, 119 |
| 13.506, 124n25 | 14.609–22, 163 |
| 13.510, 109 | 14.623–771, 163 |
| 13.510–18, 109 | 14.635–36, 171n9 |
| 13.512–13, 110 | 14.654–766, 173n26 |
| 13.516, 109 | 14.727, 227 |
| 13.518, 109 | 14.770, 171n6 |
| 13.518–19, 124n25 | 14.770–71, 165 |
| 13.523–26, 110 | 14.772–76, 163 |
| 13.524, 117 | 14.779–851, 174n30 |
| 13.533–37, 111 | 14.800–805, 164 |
| 13.534, 113 | 15.75–76, 240 |
| 13.538–48, 111–12 | 15.75–95, 240 |
| 13.541, 112 | 15.75–478, 240 |
| 13.542, 112 | 15.94–95, 240 |
| 13.544, 117 | 15.95, 240 |
| 13.545, 114 | 15.422–25, 122n13 |
| 13.546, 112, 117 | 15.751, 139 |
| 13.548, 120 | 15.758, 151n63 |
| 13.549, 117 | 15.760, 151n63 |
| 13.549–64, 112 | 15.760–61, 139 |
| 13.558, 114 | 15.836, 140 |
| 13.559, 117 | 15.837, 140 |
| 13.560, 113 | 15.850–51, 140 |
| 13.561–64, 112 | 15.850–54, 139 |
| 13.562, 117 | 15.850–60, 136 |
| 13.564, 115 | 15.855–70, 198 |
| | 15.856, 137 |
| | 15.857, 148n36 |

- 15.860, 138, 141
 15.871-79, 187
 15.875-76, 224n37
 15.877-78, 189
Pont.
 1.2.25-28, 190
 1.2.29-32, 191
 1.2.33-34, 191
 2.2.55, 193n22
 2.2.61, 193n22
 2.3.92, 193n22
 2.4.15, 195n39
 2.9.44, 191n3
 3.3.75, 193n22
 3.6.42, 191n3
 3.9.11, 193n22
 4.3.56, 194n29
 4.8.20, 193n22
 4.8.45-90, 144n6
 4.15.25, 193n22
Tr.
 1.1.69-72, 185
 1.1.79-82, 186
 1.1.117-20, 190
 1.2.99, 193n22
 1.3.37, 193n22
 1.7.15-22, 180
 1.7.33-40, 182
 2.38, 132
 2.103-8, 183
 2.109, 193n22
 2.207, 182
 2.313, 186
 2.377-78, 65n3
 3.1.52, 193n22
 3.5.52, 193n22
 3.6.26, 193n22
 3.7.45-54, 188
 3.11.34, 193n22
 3.11.39-54, 191n3
 3.14.23-24, 189
 3.14.37-38, 192n12
 4.1.19-24, 182
 4.1.23, 193n22
 4.1.67-68, 195n39
 4.2.9, 152n73
 4.3.69, 195n35
 4.4.39, 193n22
 4.6.42, 240
 4.7.12, 215
 4.8.40, 193n22
 4.10.57, 195n39
 4.10.90, 193n22
 4.10.123, 188
 4.10.125-32, 188
 4.10.128, 189
 5.1.10, 187
 5.1.53-54, 191n3
 5.12.45-46, 176
 5.12.47-48, 176
 5.12.51-54, 178
 5.12.59-60, 177
 Pausanias
 9.31.9, 275n38
 Petronius
 141.9, 248n26
 Pindar
Isthm.
 5.39-41, 97n3
 8.31-36, 130
Ol.
 2.81-83, 97n3
 Plato
Phdr.
 247c7, 29
Resp.
 390c, 66n8
 Plutarch
Mor.
 917F, 275n29
 Propertius
 2.23.1, 189
 3.5.41, 248n25

Statius

Achil.

- 1.1–7, 92
- 1.133–34, 94
- 1.269–70, 94
- 1.480–82, 95
- 1.657–60, 90
- 1.775–83, 91
- 1.824–26, 275n30

Theb.

- 1.4–17, 203
- 1.5, 223n23
- 1.6, 205
- 1.15–16, 204
- 1.46–48, 205
- 1.57–87, 213
- 1.74–75, 205
- 1.153–54, 207
- 1.180–85, 207
- 1.181, 223n23
- 1.183, 207
- 1.227–31, 206
- 1.312–14, 207, 211
- 1.324, 209
- 1.324–35, 207–8
- 1.533–47, 209
- 1.541–51, 223n28
- 1.540–43, 210
- 1.543, 223n28
- 1.543–47, 210
- 1.545, 211
- 1.557–720, 209
- 1.562–74, 212
- 1.569, 213
- 1.570, 213
- 1.574–75, 213
- 1.575, 213
- 1.597–98, 213
- 1.598–99, 213
- 1.599–600, 213
- 1.601, 213

- 3.180, 223n23
- 3.300, 223n23
- 3.406, 207
- 3.656, 223n23
- 4.648, 223n23
- 4.734–35, 235
- 5.347, 275n29
- 6.462, 209
- 6.755, 245, 248n27
- 7.442–43, 223n23
- 7.600, 223n23
- 8.218, 223n23
- 8.229, 223n23
- 8.330, 223n23
- 8.686, 223n23
- 9.144, 223n23
- 9.334, 223n23
- 9.567, 223n23
- 9.709, 223n23
- 10.126, 223n23
- 10.297, 223n23
- 10.427, 110
- 10.480–81, 223n23
- 10.648, 223n23
- 11.212, 223n23
- 11.303, 223n23

Quintillian

- 4.1.77, 209
- 10.1.88, 6

Quintus Curtius Rufus

Alex.

- 5.1.6, 248n23

Seneca the Elder

Controv.

- 2.2.8–12, 6
- 2.2.12, 196
- 10.4.3, 235

Seneca the Younger

Ep.

- 97.8, 67n26

- Med.*
 640–41, 235
 1357–58, 235
Phaed.
 281, 248n20
 [Seneca]
Oct.
 69, 248n22
 Silius Italicus
 2.362, 227, 247n7
 2.367, 246n4
 2.461–74, 233
 2.464, 247n13
 2.472, 240
 2.521–25, 241
 2.562–63, 227
 3.312–16, 215
 3.314, 215
 11.272–74, 215
 11.290, 216
 11.291–92, 216
 11.329–54, 223n33
 11.441–42, 217
 11.446–48, 217
 11.449–52, 217
 11.453–58, 217
 11.461–80, 217
 12.85–86, 218
 12.88–101, 218
 12.92–95, 219
 Sophocles
Poimenes
F 497–521 *Radt*, 71
F 497 *Radt*, 71
F 499 *Radt*, 71
F 500 *Radt*, 71
F 501 *Radt*, 71
 Spenser
Faerie Queene
 2.12.52, 276n43
 Strabo
Geog.
 14.1.45, 276n42
 Suetonius
Aug.
 7.2, 150n60
 Tacitus
Ann.
 2.75, 107
 Theocritus
 16.49, 97n8
 Valerius Flaccus
 1.1–3, 198
 1.2, 198
 1.15–21, 198
 1.64–70, 199
 1.130–48, 198
 1.133, 148n36
 2.451–52, 199
 2.451–549, 199
 2.463, 200
 2.464, 200
 2.465–66, 200
 2.468–69, 200
 2.471–92, 200
 2.493–96, 200, 222n13
 2.512–49, 200
 2.545–49, 222n16
 2.575–76, 200
 4.616, 198
 5.333–35, 201
 5.333–51, 201
 5.341–49, 201
 5.542, 202, 203
 5.543, 202, 203
 5.544, 202
 5.545, 202
 5.547, 203
 5.548, 202
 6.495–502, 201

Valerius Maximus

2.10.8, 67n26

Varro

Ling.

5.18–19, 30

Vergil

Aen.

1.711, 248n21

1.728–30, 209

1.728–56, 223n28

1.749, 209

2.277, 109

2.501–2, 104

2.515–25, 105

2.547–49, 150n58

3.13–68, 105

3.50, 105

3.60, 117

3.300–305, 107

4.66, 248n20

4.90, 248n21

4.174–90, 151n62

5.159–82, 98n24

5.414, 222n14

6.14–33, 218

6.30–33, 218

6.123, 222n14

6.392, 222n14

6.460, 5

6.640–41, 276n39

6.801, 222n14

7.312, 246n4

8.134–36, 216

8.201–12, 211

8.203, 222n14

8.219, 222n14

8.249, 222n14

8.256, 222n14

8.363, 222n14

8.389, 248n20

9.815–18, 120

10.321, 222n14

10.461, 222n14

10.464, 222n14

10.565–68, 148n38

11.286, 223n25

12.154, 273n13

12.220–21, 248n24

12.516–20, 98n24

12.650, 273n13

12.945–52, 116

12.946, 117

12.949, 117

Ciris

54–91, 278n60

Ecl.

1.82, 247n16

3.79, 24n21

6.74–77, 209, 278n60

7.61, 222n14

10.44–45, 66n14

G.

1.34–35, 45n24

3.4, 268

3.128, 248n25

3.224–28, 201, 222n17

3.460, 247n13

4.333–47, 64

4.345–47, 64

4.454–527, 273n20

Xenophanes

21 B 11 D–K, 66n8

Wisconsin Studies in Classics

LAURA MCCLURE, MARK STANSBURY-O'DONNELL, AND
MATTHEW ROLLER, SERIES EDITORS

Romans and Barbarians: The Decline of the Western Empire

E. A. THOMPSON

A History of Education in Antiquity

H. I. MARROU, translated from the French by GEORGE LAMB

Accountability in Athenian Government

JENNIFER TOLBERT ROBERTS

Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary

ERIKA SIMON

Roman Cities: Les villes romaines

PIERRE GRIMAL, edited and translated by

G. MICHAEL WOLOCH

Ancient Greek Art and Iconography

Edited by WARREN G. MOON

Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture

KATHERINE DOHAN MORROW

The Classical Epic Tradition

JOHN KEVIN NEWMAN

Ancient Anatolia: Aspects of Change and Cultural Development

Edited by JEANNY VORYS CANBY, EDITH PORADA, BRUNILDE

SISMONDO RIDGWAY, and TAMARA STECH

Euripides and the Tragic Tradition

ANN NORRIS MICHELINI

*Wit and the Writing of History: The Rhetoric of Historiography in
Imperial Rome*

PAUL PLASS

*The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals
in Antiquity*

Edited by WENDY J. RASCHKE

Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity

Edited by F. M. CLOVER and R. S. HUMPHREYS

The Hellenistic Aesthetic

BARBARA HUGHES FOWLER

Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

Hellenistic Poetry: An Anthology

Selected and translated by BARBARA HUGHES FOWLER

Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre

KATHRYN J. GUTZWILLER

Rome and India: The Ancient Sea Trade

Edited by VIMALA BEGLEY and RICHARD DANIEL DE PUMA

Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography

RUDOLF BLUM, translated by HANS H. WELLISCH

Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth Century B.C. Athens

DAVID CASTRIOTA

Archaic Greek Poetry: An Anthology

Selected and translated by BARBARA HUGHES FOWLER

Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria

Edited by RICHARD DANIEL DE PUMA and

JOCELYN PENNY SMALL

The Wedding in Ancient Athens

JOHN H. OAKLEY and REBECCA H. SINOS

The World of Roman Costume

Edited by JUDITH LYNN SEBESTA and LARISSA BONFANTE

Greek Heroine Cults

JENNIFER LARSON

Flinders Petrie: A Life in Archaeology

MARGARET S. DROWER

Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition

Edited by WARREN G. MOON

The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: Arena Sport and Political Suicide

PAUL PLASS

Polygnotos and Vase Painting in Classical Athens

SUSAN B. MATHESON

Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon

Edited by JENIFER NEILS

Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands

PAMELA A. WEBB

Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence

Edited by LUCY GOODISON and CHRISTINE MORRIS

Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius

JO-MARIE CLAASSEN

Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200–100 B.C.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture

PAT GETZ-GENTLE

The Complete Poetry of Catullus

CATULLUS, translated and with commentary by DAVID MULROY

Hellenistic Sculpture III: The Styles of ca. 100–31 B.C.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

The Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases in the Archaic and Classical Periods

ANGELIKI KOSMOPOULOU

Discs of Splendor: The Relief Mirrors of the Etruscans

ALEXANDRA A. CARPINO

Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's "Heroides"

SARA H. LINDHEIM

Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art

GRAHAM ZANKER

Religion in Ancient Etruria

JEAN-RENÉ JANNOT, translated by JANE K. WHITEHEAD

A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in "Odes" IV

TIMOTHY JOHNSON

Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's "Satires," Book 1

CATHERINE M. SCHLEGEL

Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World

Edited by CHRISTOPHER A. FARAONE and LAURA K. MCCLURE

Asinaria: The One about the Asses

PLAUTUS, translated and with commentary by JOHN HENDERSON

Ulysses in Black: Ralph Ellison, Classicism, and African American Literature

PATRICE D. RANKINE

Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius

PAUL REHAK, edited by JOHN G. YOUNGER

Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the "Metamorphoses"

PATRICIA J. JOHNSON

Pandora's Senses: The Feminine Character of the Ancient Text

VERED LEV KENAN

Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library

ERIK GUNDERSON

New Perspectives on Etruria and Early Rome

Edited by SINCLAIR BELL and HELEN NAGY

The Image of the Poet in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"

BARBARA PAVLOCK

Responses to Oliver Stone's "Alexander": Film, History, and Cultural Studies

Edited by PAUL CARTLEDGE and FIONA ROSE GREENLAND

The Codrus Painter: Iconography and Reception of Athenian Vases in the Age of Pericles

AMALIA AVRAMIDOU

The Matter of the Page: Essays in Search of Ancient and Medieval Authors

SHANE BUTLER

Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE

Edited by ALLISON GLAZEBROOK and MADELEINE M. HENRY

Sophocles' "Philoctetes" and the Great Soul Robbery

NORMAN AUSTIN

Oedipus Rex

SOPHOCLES, a verse translation by DAVID MULROY, with introduction
and notes

The Slave in Greece and Rome

JOHN ANDREAU and RAYMOND DESCAT, translated by
MARION LEOPOLD

Perfidy and Passion: Reintroducing the "Iliad"

MARK BUCHAN

*The Gift of Correspondence in Classical Rome: Friendship in Cicero's
"Ad Familiares" and Seneca's "Moral Epistles"*

AMANDA WILCOX

Antigone

SOPHOCLES, a verse translation by DAVID MULROY,
with introduction and notes

Aeschylus's "Suppliant Women": The Tragedy of Immigration

GEOFFREY W. BAKEWELL

Couched in Death: "Klinai" and Identity in Anatolia and Beyond

ELIZABETH P. BAUGHAN

Silence in Catullus

BENJAMIN ELDON STEVENS

Odes

HORACE, translated with commentary by DAVID R. SLAVITT

Shaping Ceremony: Monumental Steps and Greek Architecture

MARY B. HOLLINSHEAD

Selected Epigrams

MARTIAL, translated with notes by SUSAN MCLEAN

The Offense of Love: "Ars Amatoria," "Remedia Amoris," and "Tristia" 2

OVID, a verse translation by JULIA DYSON HEJDUK, with introduction
and notes

Oedipus at Colonus

SOPHOCLES, a verse translation by DAVID MULROY, with introduction
and notes

Women in Roman Republican Drama

Edited by DOROTA DUTSCH, SHARON L. JAMES, and
DAVID KONSTAN

Dream, Fantasy, and Visual Art in Roman Elegy

EMMA SCIOLI

*"Trojan Women," "Helen," "Hecuba": Three Plays about Women and
the Trojan War*

EURIPIDES, verse translations by FRANCIS BLESSINGTON,
with introduction and notes

Echoing Hylas: A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics

MARK HEERINK

Horace between Freedom and Slavery: The First Book of "Epistles"

STEPHANIE McCARTER

The Play of Allusion in the "Historia Augusta"

DAVID ROHRBACHER

Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the "Metamorphoses"

Edited by LAUREL FULKERSON and TIM STOVER

Virgil and Joyce: Nationalism and Imperialism in the "Aeneid" and "Ulysses"

RANDALL J. POGORZELSKI

The Athenian Adonia in Context: The Adonis Festival as Cultural Practice

LAURIALAN REITZAMMER